Univ. of
Toronto
Library

BINDING STATION 1 S 1923

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/moseslaw00lattuoft

mmenT.(O.T.)
L.

Moses and the Law:

A STUDY OF PENTATEUCH PROBLEMS.

BY

FATHERS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

Edited by

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.,

Professor of Holy Scripture
at St. Beuno's College,
North Wales.

184468.
S. 10. 2

G. C. GRIFFITHS & CO.,
26, East Street, Baker Street, London, W.1.

1922.

Imprimi Potest:

WILLIAM BODKIN, S.J.

Nihil Obstat:

F. THOMAS BERGH, O.S.D.,
Censor deputatus.

Imprimatur:

EDM. CAN. SURMOUNT,
Vic. Gen.

Westmonasterii, die 15 Maii, 1922.

PREFACE.

THIS work consists of a series of essays which appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, and are here reproduced by kind permission of the publishers, Messrs. Browne & Nolan, Ltd. They represent an effort to state the main problems presented by the Pentateuch, literary, historical, scientific and religious; and to offer solutions, or at least suggestions towards solution, compatible with Catholic doctrine. It is not always possible to find a solution that can be called certain, nor has Almighty God promised His Church that one should always be forthcoming; it is enough that there should always be reasonably certain grounds for accepting her teaching, and that her teaching should declare divine truth and be a safeguard against error. This little work, therefore, in no way claims to exhaust the possibilities of the faith that seeks to understand, *fides quaerens intellectum;* it will be enough if it helps but a little to promote that better knowledge, to encourage Catholic scholars to master the evidence and attempt a wider and deeper reconciliation, to persuade all Christians that truth can never clash with truth.

C. L.

For the purposes of this Edition, some Editorial Notes have been added at the end of the Essays.

N.B. I-II Kings in the Douay Version are I-II Samuel in the Revised Version, III-IV Kings are I-II Kings, I-II Paralipomenon are I-II Chronicles.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE DAYS OF GENESIS. By LEO O'HEA, S.J. 1

THE ALLEGED SOURCES OF GENESIS I—III. By CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 10

THE FLOOD. By CUTHBERT BAILLON, S.J. 21

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN. By JOSEPH PARSONS, S.J... 34

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT. By CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 47

WELLHAUSEN AND THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD. By JOHN MANNING, S.J. 58

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PENTATEUCH. By CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J. 68

GENESIS AND EVOLUTION. By THOMAS AGIUS, S.J... 81

THE RELIGION OF THE PENTATEUCH. By GILBERT BINNS, S.J.... 95

THE DAYS OF GENESIS.

THE first chapter of the Book of Genesis narrates the creation of the universe and of the living and inanimate world in a story of work accomplished in six days. If the most rigorously literal interpretation be attached to the text, disregarding all considerations but the meaning of the individual words as they stand, the account appears to commit itself to three statements: (1) The world was created in six stages, the work of each being begun and completed within one day: 'And there was evening and there was morning, a second . . . a third day.' (2) Each stage was comprehensive and the time allotted to it did not overlap with that of any other stage. (3) The six stages are placed in a definite order of succession in time.

These statements, whether taken together or singly, seem to be irreconcilable with the world's history so far as we know it in the light of science, notably of the sciences of astronomy and palæontology.

The problem has come into special prominence in modern times. Many have attempted to bring the two into harmony, working on the assumption that the account of Genesis and the account of science describe the same objective facts. Another school of students have sought to raise the document from the arena of conflict by suggesting that a study of the writer's mind as revealed by the literary style of the chapter, the circumstances amid which it was written, the purpose and the audience for which it was intended, shows that the two accounts can have no point of contact in the same plane. Speaking roughly, then, the main solutions fall into two groups, hypotheses of reconciliation and idealistic hypotheses. Evidently either may be carried to extremes.

It will be convenient to open with a short summary of the first chapter of Genesis, to which we can afterwards refer:

it will also serve to bring out at once one aspect of the rhythmical and symmetrical character of the narrative.

Before the days	Gen. i.	1-2:	1=summary. 2=first state (waste of waters and darkness)	
First day	i.	3-5:	light, producing days	Forward Movement: *Areas.*
Second day	i.	6-8:	heaven, dividing (1) waters above, (2) waters below, beneath which latter is the land	
Third day	i.	9-13:	(1) 9-10: land emerges from waters below	
			(2) 11-13: land: non-animal (plants)	
Fourth day	i.	14-19:	heaven: non-animal (stars, etc.)	
Fifth day	i.	20-23:	water: (no non-animal) animal (fish)	Strophic: *Populations.*
			heaven: animal (birds)	
Sixth day	i.	24-31:	land: animal (beasts) MAN	

The first difficulty that presents itself in the acceptance of this cosmogony is one of order. Light, day and night, land and sea, and plants are all made before the sun and the other heavenly bodies. But plants, as we know them, live by the warmth and light of the sun, while light, day and night, presuppose its existence. Again, we know the earth to be but a satellite of the sun, one of a number of planets in the solar system. Fairly strong evidence points to a common origin of the system, to the hypothesis that the earth and other planets have been thrown off from a condensing mass of hot vapour, that they have cooled down and solidified while the condensing nucleus became the sun. It seems incredible that the earth, with dry land and water, with alternations of day and night, and with vegetable life complete, should have been in existence before the sun.

The difficulty was stated by Origen [1] and other members of the Alexandrine schools, Jewish and Christian, most of whom entirely rejected the verbal interpretation of the six days.

Distinguished men of science, Sir J. W. Dawson and Professor J. Dana, have reverently attempted to attach to the words an interpretation which is in harmony with our knowledge of the earth's place in the solar system. They

[1] Origen, *De Principiis*, iv. 16: 'What man in his right senses can believe that there could have been a first, a second, a third day, evening and morning, without sun, moon or stars?'

suggest that the fourth day records not the creation of the sun, but its visible appearance from the earth, the dispelling of a mist which had enveloped it from the beginning. The creation of the sun, it is suggested, took place before the work of the six days and is included in the preliminary act of the first verse. This suggestion, however, fails to achieve its object, the harmonizing of facts with the exact words of the document. If the sun was not made, but made to appear through the clearing mist, it is difficult to see why the sacred writer did not say so, for he must have foreseen the difficulty. Father Hetzenauer, in a passage to which we shall return, quotes to the point the words of St. Stephen, ' And Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.' [1] Nor does the suggestion offer a complete solution of the scientific difficulties—for grass, plants, and trees are not to be satisfied with the unseen action of the sun through a mist. They require for the ordinary and essential processes of their life the not infrequent action of direct sunshine.

Equally serious are the objections raised by geology to the order assigned in Genesis. In geology we have a record which is necessarily incomplete, but, so far as it is accessible, it is consistent. It is accepted in all its main conclusions by geologists of every school and country, and is strengthened rather than weakened as research progresses. The outer portion of the earth's crust is mainly formed of an orderly series of rocks which are rendered accessible to investigation in many places by distortion of the earth's surface in the past, by the erosion of rivers or sea, and by borings and excavations. The composition of many of these layers indicates that they have been formed in remote ages by a gradual deposition of mud or sand at the bottom of a former sea. Fossils, traces of former animal or vegetable life are found in all those layers of which the material is favourable to the preservation of such remains. Some layers, as chalk and coal, are formed almost entirely of organic remains. Each layer contains a characteristic flora or fauna. The lower layers contain only the lower forms of life and types now extinct. A gradual progression of life towards higher forms, more nearly approaching those existing to-day, is revealed as we pass upwards through the series. Each layer contains a story of past inundations by land and sea, and shows the successive appearance of types, and the existence

[1] Acts vii. 22.

of ancient types when more recent forms had not yet come into being.

The order of life as shown by the rocks is very difficult to reconcile with the order of the six days in Genesis.[1] The order of Genesis is :—

> Third day.—Grass, plants, trees.
> Fifth day.—Aquatic animals, large and small, and birds.
> Sixth day.—Land animals, reptiles, man.

The rock series, however, show invertebrate animal life in abundance before any but the lowliest forms of plant life—fishes (extinct types) before the plants of the coal age—some reptiles and mammals before the earliest of modern trees. The vegetable creation, therefore, assigned to the third day, appears in part along with the creatures of the fifth day, in part with those of the sixth, and, as we know it now, subsequent to both. Similarly, reptiles appear in the rock series long before birds, thus partially inverting the order of the fifth and sixth days.

The order of Genesis, then, seems to be different from the order of geology; and the sets of creation which Genesis marks off into distinct compartments, one ended before the other begins, appear from geology to overlap.

The question of time presents a further difficulty. In Genesis each group appears within twenty-four hours. The whole process is completed in six days. Now, the processes revealed by a study of the rocks have their counterpart and find a repetition in the work of rivers and seas to-day. We can see fresh geological layers in actual process of formation. If the products of the past were formed in a manner in any way resembling that of similar products to-day, the minimum duration of the ages required for the formation of the successive geological layers can scarce be measured in hundreds of thousands of years. The years required for the cooling of the earth to a condition suitable for life can only be estimated in millions.

It has been contended that the word *yôm* in Hebrew, rendered ' day ' in our versions, is susceptible of a meaning

[1] The late Professor Driver, in his *Genesis* (p. 21), gives a convenient table of the succession of life upon the globe, taken from Dawson's *Chain of Life in Geological Time*. While we admit the cogency of much of his argument against too literal an interpretaton of the biblical account, we must differ from him widely in his more general conclusions, which, not to speak of graver defects, betray considerable lack of literary imagination.

such that it might designate a period of time of any duration. However, even if this interpretation is accepted, the difficulty presented by a statement of successive, distinct, non-overlapping groups remains. But the context of itself renders this interpretation extremely difficult. The writer has practically removed ambiguity by the phrase, ' And there was evening and there was morning, one day.'

While it may be impossible in certain circumstances to reject the dictates of generalized laws of natural science without supposing miracles, science as such can in no case declare a miracle to be impossible. Theology, however, may place grave objections in the way of an unlimited postulation of miracles. We cannot suppose on the part of God a suspension of a law or a harmonious process which He has Himself established without a reason and a purpose which commends itself to the Divine Intelligence, still less if the only apparent result is deception.

If, therefore, we are to call for supposed miracles in support of a theory, we should not do so unless compelled by a theological necessity. If a verbally literal acceptation of the cosmogony of Genesis appears to demand the hypothesis of miracles, we should be very careful to ask ourselves whether in reality theology does bind us to such an interpretation.

Leaving aside for the moment other grounds of theological authority, does our belief in the veracity of the sacred writer oblige us to read history into every letter of his narrative? To answer this question we must consider the purpose and aim of the writer, the literary style of the document, the character of the people among whom and for whom, in the first instance, it was written. A writer of a modern text-book of science might prefer, for the purpose of logical exposition, to classify creatures otherwise, at greater length, with much distracting detail, committing himself, perhaps, to one or two unproven theories. Such is not the method of the author of Genesis. He describes phenomena just as any unlearned man might were he asked to enumerate all that he sees around him. Or, again, an enumeration might have been omitted. All creation might have been summed up in a word, but this would have been to neglect the arts of oratory, and the sermon of Genesis would have been a poor one.

It will already be clear from the plan which we have given early in this essay, and which the reader should now consider attentively, that the order in which creation is grouped has

so pronounced a symmetry that it naturally leads us to suppose that it is, in the strict sense of the word, artificial, the expression of incomparable art. The sacred writer has summed up the creation of the universe, not with an eye to the *chronological* sequence in which its several parts appeared, but with a definite *logical* scheme in his mind. This is well brought out by the learned Capuchin and Roman professor of Holy Scripture, Father Hetzenauer, in his excellent commentary on Genesis, in a passage which appears to be worth translating at length (p. 41) :—

The sacred writer himself indicates not obscurely that the periods[1] are arranged, not in a chronological, but in an ideal order. For he speaks first of the solar light, and afterwards of the substance of the sun; first of the division of light and darkness, day and night, and afterwards of the luminaries which effect that division; first of the plants bearing flowers and fruits, and afterwards of the rays of the sun, without which plants cannot exist (Gen. i. 3-5, 12, 14-18). If an author ' learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians ' (Acts vii. 22) writes in this way, he sufficiently hints that he is observing, not a chronological, but an ideal order. To this must be added the fact that, while prefixing the article to the number of the last day, he has omitted it before the other numbers.[2] Finally, the idea, in accordance with which the sacred writer arranged the material which he took from tradition, is plain. First comes the work of division (the production of areas), then the work of equipment (the production of populations); first what is general, then what is particular; first what is more imperfect is described, then what is more perfect. Just as Matthew arranged the works of Christ not chronologically, but in a historico-dogmatical or ideal order, even so did Moses narrate the creation of the world.

The force of Father Hetzenauer's words will be all the clearer, as we have said, if they are read in the light of the scheme on page 2, above. A second scheme will serve to bring out still further that rhythmical correspondence of the different parts of the narrative which is so characteristic of the more poetical forms of Hebrew literature. It should be taken in conjunction with the first. It may be seen in full in Father von Hummelauer's *Genesis* (p. 84); space forbids that we should do more than summarize it here. Each day begins with a divine command, and the third and sixth days

[1] Father Hetzenauer prefers to speak of the ' days ' as actual periods, not as natural days introduced for a setting. If once it be allowed, as he allows, that these periods are arranged in an ideal order, this ulterior point loses much of its importance; but against Father Hetzenauer's view it may be urged that the mention of ' evening ' and ' morning ' renders it almost impossible either to take the days as periods or to suppose that they are represented as overlapping (cf. p. 5).

[2] ' *The* sixth day,' Gen. i. 31. We are not inclined to lay much stress on this argument.

contain two, because there are two important creative acts in each of these days. 'And God said: Let there be light. . . . Let there be a firmament. . . .' And then, six times in our present Hebrew text, and once beside in the Septuagint, comes the fulfilment: 'And there was light. . . . And it was so.' Then in due order comes the description of what is made ('And God made the firmament . . .'), the naming (thrice), the praising ('And God saw that it was good . . .'), and the blessing (twice). Nothing so regular in its symmetrical movement can be found in the rest of the Bible; and to the Hebrew (as to the modern, if he has cultivated his literary experience) this would speak volumes as to the character of the narrative before him. Not merely is the language held of God anthropomorphic, in that He is said to see, to speak, even to rest—a daring figure, eloquent of His freedom and personality, and a lesson on the precept of the sabbath—but nature itself, if we may say so, is dealt with anthropomorphically, is reduced to categories or heads of divisions that, as in the case of the terms employed of God, find their governing principles in the needs of human thought, at all events of primitive human thought, rather than in a dull enumeration that could make no appeal to head or heart.

And we can now see that the narrative is true, full of deepest truth, because it is describing and enforcing objective truth, but in a literary form adapted to the Orientals whom it was originally intended to teach. To see falsehood in it would only be the mark of a narrow and illiterate pedantry. The writer is not bent upon a scientific or scholastic treatise, nor does he affect the sorry tricks of journalism; but he is the inspired seer whose chief purpose is to bring it home to the people committed to him that God is the One Supreme Creator of all, personal, intelligent and free, that man is the master of the world, the world is made for man, but made by God, and man is God's creature like the rest.

Poetical language is often most effective as the vehicle of truth and of history, and it would be idle to seek therein the same manner of expression or the precise form of truth that we should find in a more matter-of-fact document. We cannot forbear to quote an illustration, though a somewhat extreme one, brought forward by Professor Henry

[1] *Nineteenth Century, February*, 1886. A somewhat similar treatment of the subject is to be found in 'The First Chapter of Genesis,' an article by Prof. W. G. Elmslie in the *Contemporary Review* for December, 1887.

Drummond, writing in 1886,[1] on the occasion of the historic controversy between Professor Huxley and Mr. Gladstone :—

George Macdonald [he writes] has an exquisite little poem called 'Baby's Catechism.' It occurs among his children's pieces:

Where did you come from, baby dear?
Out of the everywhere into here.

Where did you get your eyes so blue?
Out of the sky as I came through.

Where did you get that little tear?
I found it waiting when I got here.

Where did you get that pearly ear?
God spoke and it came out to hear.

How did they all just come to be you?
God thought about me and so I grew.

For its purpose [asks Professor Drummond] what could be a finer, or even a more true account of the matter than this? Without a word of literal truth in it, it would convey to the child's mind exactly the right impression. Now, conceive of the head nurse banishing it from the nursery as calculated to mislead children as to the origin of blue eyes. Or imagine the nursery governess who has passed the South Kensington examination in Mr. Huxley's Physiology informing her pupils that ears never 'came out' at all, and that hearing was really done inside, by the fibres of Corti and the epithelial arrangements of the maculae acousticae. Is it conceivable, on the other hand, that the parish clergyman could defend the record on the ground that 'the everywhere' was a philosophical presentation of the Almighty, or that 'God thought about me' contained the Hegelian idea? And yet this is precisely what interpreters of Genesis and interpreters of science do with the Bible. Genesis is a presentation of one or two great elementary truths to the childhood of the world. It can only be read aright in the spirit in which it was written, with its original purpose in view, and its original audience. What did it mean to them? What did they need to know and not to know?

We have not been able to leave ourselves any space wherein to discuss the matter adequately from the point of view of authority, though it will have been evident to the careful reader that we were keeping its pronouncements in view. The Biblical Commission, under date of June 30, 1909,[1] has promulgated certain answers with regard to the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis, and it need hardly be said that we have no desire to put forward anything that is not in entire accord with the decisions there arrived at. We are encouraged to think that we have not done so, not only by a careful study of the answers themselves, but also by the fact that in this matter

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. i., pp. 567-9.

we are merely walking in the steps of a capable and conservative biblical scholar, Père Brucker, S.J., with whose treatment of the subject in that most admirable and useful work, the *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*,[2] we are in entire agreement. It must suffice to note here that the hypothesis of the simultaneous creation put forward by several Latin and Greek Fathers, and notably by St. Augustine, leave such an interpretation, and the whole question of ' days ' in general, an open one to Catholics, in accordance with the principles laid down in the fourth answer of the Commission. In the eighth answer a wide liberty is allowed in the interpretation of the word *yôm* (day), a concession clearly intended to show that the exegesis of the word is one of the difficulties contemplated in the fifth answer; is, in fact, a case in which ' reason forbids us to defend the strict sense, necessity compels us to abandon it.' And our explanations do not affect the vital doctrines mentioned in the third answer, in regard of which ' the literal historical sense ' may not be called in question. We have already pointed out (page 7, above) the great truths which the first chapter of Genesis forcibly inculcates.

The second answer of the Biblical Commission which, among other things, denies that the first three chapters contain ' fables borrowed from the mythologies and cosmogonies of ancient people ' and expurgated, leads us to conclude with a brief word on the origin of the first chapter. In the essay on the Flood, by Father C. Baillon, S.J., a comparison is instituted between the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts, and the conclusion reached that ' the general agreement ' between the two ' seems to point clearly to a common source.' In the present case, however, there is no such general agreement, and it seems sufficient to remark that the attempt, in itself admirable, to establish a similar connexion does not carry conviction.

Note.—While this book has been passing through the Press, the first volume has appeared of some valuable conferences by Prof. H. de Dorlodot on Darwinism (Le Darwinisme au point de vue de l'Orthodoxie catholique. Par Henry De Dorlodot, Docteur en Théologie et en Sciences naturelles, Ancien Professeur de Théologie dogmatique au Séminaire de Namur, Professeur de Géologie et de Paléontologie stratigraphique à l'Université catholique de Louvain, Premier volume: L'Origine des Espèces. Vrymant et Co.: Bruxelles et Paris: 1921). It must be enough to say here that while strongly confirming in several points what has been written above, it also throws further light upon ' Genesis and Evolution,' the subject of a later essay.

[2] Vol. ii., col. 283-6, part of his article ' Genèse.'

ALLEGED SOURCES OF GENESIS I-III.

In the present essay some criticisms will be offered upon the division of these three chapters into two supposed sources, as the first example, and an important one, of the working of the 'Documentary Hypothesis.' Some account of this latter is given by Father Manning, S.J., in the essay on 'Wellhausen and the Levitical Priesthood.' What should especially be noticed, what gives to the Documentary Hypothesis its peculiar character, is that the main sources which are proposed for the Pentateuch are also said to mark stages in the historical development of the Jews. The Jahvistic (Yahwistic) and Elohistic sources, known as J and E, are said to date from the eighth or ninth century, and these, speaking quite broadly, are taken to represent the trustworthy narratives of primitive fact. The Book of Deuteronomy, which we may take as roughly equivalent to the source D, is admitted by all students alike to have been found by the priest Helcias in the Temple in 621 B.C. (4 Kings xxii. 8). The critics, however, would further maintain that the book had been written but a little time before, and many of them, indeed, would regard the whole proceeding as fraudulent, and the finding as an elaborate fiction. In any case, they would say that D put into Moses' mouth regulations which were found desirable at the latter date. But in the case of the Priestly Code, P, comprising all Leviticus, and also fragments, large and small, of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Josue, not merely was this done, but a history of the Mosaic period was concocted in accordance with the later laws, as though they had been substantially in force from the beginning. This last source would date from the Babylonian exile, in the sixth century.

One only has to realize the general character of what is assigned to the Priestly Code to see that this Documentary

Hypothesis, if accepted, must profoundly affect our interpretation of the whole of the Old Testament. If the Priestly Code was of obligation, it must have deeply coloured the life and customs both of nation and individual from the very beginning; if it did not exist, the exile brought about a transformation almost rivalling that needed on the rationalistic hypothesis to develop Christianity from the work of Christ. For to the Priestly Code is relegated, not merely what belongs to systematic chronology, but what belongs to systematic religion. 'In P's picture of the Mosaic age,' says Dr. Driver,[1] 'the minute description of the tabernacle, sacrifices, and other ceremonial institutions, the systematic marshalling of the nation by tribes and families, and the unity of purpose and action which in consequence regulates its movements (Numbers i-iv, x. 11-28, etc.), are the most conspicuous features.' And hence we may say that the Documentary Hypothesis, such as we know it in its main essentials to-day, sprang into being, not when Astruc, in the eighteenth century, first essayed to use the divine names as a basis for the partition of a Pentateuch still acknowledged Mosaic, but when Reuss, in the nineteenth, stated the view that the Priestly Code was not, as supposed till then, the most ancient, but the latest of the component documents. His theory was popularized by Graf and Wellhausen, and outside the Church it holds the field to-day. It marked the final passage into evolutionary rationalism; for the Priestly Code is no longer a historical document at all, but an audacious attempt—to say no more—to read back the institutions of a later time into primitive history.

It is not any mere question of sources as such, then, that makes the Documentary Hypothesis impossible to accept, but the historical conclusions involved in the hypothesis, such as it is actually propounded. It may be admitted without difficulty that a Biblical work may draw upon sources themselves either Biblical or non-Biblical. The author of the second book of Machabees, for example, tells us that he is summarizing a work in five books, by Jason of Cyrene (2 Mach. ii. 24); and the regular appeal by the writer of the third and fourth books of Kings to the royal chronicles of Israel or Judah make it inevitable to suppose that he had these before him and drew upon them. Indeed, in the very case of the Pentateuch, the Biblical Commission, in its decree

[1] *The Book of Genesis*, ed. 9, p. xxiii.

of June 27, 1906, expressly declares that Moses may have had recourse to sources, either written or oral. But the Documentary Hypothesis involves the denial of the historical character of at least a large part of the Pentateuch, and excludes Moses from any share, or any but the smallest share, in its authorship.

At the outset it is well to distinguish the literary and the historical aspect of the discussion. From the literary point of view we may notice as significant that, on the general question of the language of P, Driver is rather on the defensive than inclined to use it as an argument for himself,[1] and under present limitations of space we must be content to leave it at that.

The use of the divine names, too, is not made so much of nowadays, indeed the ' critics ' are at some pains to show that they rely less on this argument than is often supposed. Still, it remains a very prominent feature in their system, especially in regard of the chapters before us, so that it appears to be worth while to deal with it at some length, and more systematically than Catholic writers are wont to do. None the less, it may be premised that in any case it would not by itself prove the separate existence of P, since in J and E we should have sources capable of appropriating either divine name as it came.

The strongest argument for P as a separate source, based, that is, on the divine names, comes from Exodus vi. 3. God declares that He appeared unto Abraham and Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai (translated rather dubiously as ' God Almighty '), ' but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them.' This, then, is regarded as a proof ' that Genesis xv. 7, xxviii. 13, as also the numerous passages in Genesis in which the patriarchs make use of this name, cannot have been written by the same author.' [2] This is certainly a formidable argument; yet, is it sufficient of itself to settle the whole question? It is only a consideration of the evidence as a whole—and that, indeed, more detailed than we can attempt here—that can embolden us to answer in the negative; but even so, if the question is to be kept open at all, an alternative interpretation of the verse must be set forth at once. May we not say, then, that the name Yahweh now acquired a significance which it had not hitherto possessed? ' Hence-

[1] *Lit. O.T.*, pp. 155-7. [2] Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, p. viii.

forth,' says the French Crampon Bible, *ad loc.*, 'the name Yahweh will be the proper name, the official title of the God of Israel, and this new relation will inaugurate a new phase in the history of human salvation.' How many Fathers and medieval writers have used eloquent and devout words in reference to Our Lord's Heart, and how dear to many was the devotion to the Five Wounds; and yet might we not say that the Sacred Heart was not revealed to anyone before Blessed Margaret Mary? And this sense seems to be indicated by Holy Writ itself, in the passage under consideration, for, in Exodus vi. 7 it is written, 'ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God,' that is, they shall understand the full significance of the name; up to that time they will not have 'known' it any better than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob 'knew' it.

Curiously enough, as Wiener has pointed out,[1] this argument for the building up of P can be used for the demolition of J. According to Genesis iv. 26, it was after the birth of Enosh that 'men began to call upon the name of Yahweh,' literally, as Driver rightly explains, 'to call *with*, i.e., to use the name in invocations, in the manner of ancient cults, especially at times of sacrifice.'

> Yet [to return to Wiener] not only does the Tetragrammaton occur very freely in the narrative of the preceding chapters, but it is actually put into the mouth of Eve, the grandmother of Enosh, long before Seth, his father, had been born. She is made to say, 'I have gotten a man with *the Lord*' (Genesis iv. 1). How is this possible, on the critical theory? Why is it conceivable that the author of J could do that which, *ex hypothesi*, the author of the Pentateuch, could not?

How, indeed, can it be supposed that Eve, who avows in a so-called J section, that it is 'with Jahweh's[2] help' that she has borne a son, had never invoked Almighty God as Yahweh? As a matter of fact, on page 17, Wiener—inadvertently, one would think—gives away his own argument by changing the divine name in Genesis iv. 1, from 'Yahweh' (i.e., Lord) to 'God.' But the 'critics' appear to be right in charging him with setting too high a value upon the Greek Septuagint, important as that version is, and this emendation seems to

---

[1] *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 8.

[2] The Jews avoided the use of the divine name 'Yahweh' (or 'Jehovah,' as it has come through a misunderstanding to be presented in English), and usually read the word for 'Lord' in place of it. Hence it appears as 'Lord' in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and most later versions.

be due to this exaggerated predilection. If, then, as Driver would have it, we must explain Genesis iv. 26 of a more formal recognition of the name, why not suppose that Exodus vi. 3 represents yet another stage in the same direction? It may be noted in passing, though the issue involved cannot possibly be discussed here, that the data 'seem sufficient to show that there was a West-Semitic deity, Ya-u, known as early as *c.* 2100 B.C.' [1] This name may be identical with Yahweh, of which the etymology, or rather explanation, may be merely popular, like the explanation of Babel (Babylon) from the verb *balal*.

To pass now from Exodus vi. 3 to the consideration of the divine names in general. Not infrequently their distribution is inconsistent with the division into sources as expounded by the critics. In the case of the Book of Genesis, Wiener [2] finds 'Yahweh' out of place in two passages of P (Genesis xvii. 1, xxi. 1b: 'in both cases a redactor or copyist has to be invoked to get rid of it'), and in four passages of E (Genesis xv. 1-2, xxii. 11, xxvii. 7b: 'in all cases recourse is had as usual to a redactor'; but the fourth passage seems to be more generally assigned to J), while he counts *Elohim* ('God') in J as often as nineteen times (but it seems safer to reduce the number to fifteen). However, as Wiener truly says, 'an even more serious objection is to be found in the divisions which the critics are compelled to effect in order to carry through their theory.' These, it must be remembered, are only the misfits that obstinately remain, after every artifice has been exhausted to make the names suit the sections, and the sections the names. Perhaps we cannot do better than to quote the rest of the same rather breezy paragraph from Wiener, only explaining that the particular work he has in view throughout is *The Hexateuch according to the Revised Version, arranged in its constituent documents by members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford*, edited by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby:—

> It is one thing to suggest that a continuous passage like Genesis i. 1–ii. 3, or xi. 1-9, or xiv., may be ultimately derived from a separate source; it is quite another to postulate such proceedings as are attributed to the redactors of the critical case. The following instances are limited to those in which the appellations of the Deity are the sole or determining criterion; in xvi. the use of the Tetragrammaton in verse 2 compels Mr Carpenter to wrench 1b and 2 from a P context and assign them to J

[1] Driver, *Genesis*, Addenda ii., p. xlvii.
[2] *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 7, 8.

n xix, verse 29 is torn from a J chapter, in which it fits perfectly, to be given to P; in xx the last verse is assigned to a redactor, though all the rest of the chapter goes to E, and the verse is required for the explanation of 17; in xxii, verses 14-18 go to redactors because the story is assigned to E (a redactor being responsible for the Tetragrammaton in 11). An even more flagrant instance occurs in xxviii. 21, where Mr. Carpenter is compelled to scoop out the words ' and the Lord will be my God ' and assign them to J, the beginning and end of the verse going to E. What manner of man was this redactor who constructed a narrative on these strange principles? In xxxi, verse 3 has to go to a redactor, because the preceding and subsequent verses belong to E, yet that gentleman actually postulates the redactor's work by referring to the statement of 3 in verse 5. However, he receives compensation in xxii, where verse 30 is wrenched from a J context for his enrichment, though verse 31 (J) cannot be understood without it.

This, then, may suffice as a comment on this vivisection in general; the case of Genesis i.-iii. will be examined by itself shortly. Wiener then goes on to treat at length of the distribution of the divine names from the standpoint of textual criticism, and therein it seems to us that, as Plato hath it, there is something in what he says, yet not so much as he thinks. In any case this issue can scarcely be dealt with unless it be at great length; and it may, therefore, be wiser to pass at once on to more certain ground, the substitution of Elohim (God) for Yahweh, that is admitted to have occurred in certain Old Testament documents, and which may, therefore, be the reason why the divine names are occasionally mingled in the Pentateuch in a way that cannot be accounted for by connotation or context. Driver, for example, in his *Genesis*,[1] expressly says that the Chronicler ' is apt to show a preference for *Elohim* (though he also uses *Yahweh*), and sometimes changes *Yahweh* of his source into *Elohim*; and the exceptional preponderance of *Elohim* over *Yahweh* in Book II of the Psalms, and in Psalms 73-83, as compared with the rest of the Psalter, shows that here the editor, or collector, must have substituted it for an original Yahweh.' We omit his references, but the reader may easily see what is meant by comparing Psalm 13 (14) with Psalm 52 (53), remembering that ' Lord ' stands for Yahweh. If then, we ask, the Psalmist (in Psalm 13) and the Chronicler (i.e., in Chronicles, Paralipomenon) may fluctuate in their use of the divine names, why not Moses? If ' Yahweh ' may come to be changed elsewhere, why not in the Pentateuch? And if the name be so changed, it is unlikely, as Driver himself

[1] Excursus i., p. 407.

observes,[1] that there will be anything in the context to betray the fact.

There is also a curious example of this interchange of the divine names outside the Biblical record, which it would be a pity to omit. Schrader [2] points out that in two inscriptions of Sargon II of Assyria (722-705 B.C.) 'Jahubi'd' and 'Ilubi'd' stand for the same individual, a king, and that this is due to the interchange of 'Ilu' ('God' corresponding to 'Elohim,' or more strictly to the short form 'El') and 'Jahu' (or 'Yahu,' 'Yahweh'). As a parallel to this he recalls the change of Eliakim's name to Jehoiakim in 2 (4) Kings xxiii. 34.

And now let us come to the chapters more immediately under consideration. Much stress has, indeed, been laid on them by modern 'critics,' because nowhere else, perhaps, does the hypothesis of a duplicate narrative, borne out by a divergent use of the divine names, appear at first sight so convincing. And yet a careful analysis of the facts is far from bearing out such an impression, and it will more than repay us to have sifted thoroughly at least one such concrete example. From the beginning of Genesis to the middle of Genesis ii. 4 is assigned to P, but the second part of that verse ('in the day . . .') had to wait some centuries for its subject and verb, for from here to the end of the fourth chapter is apportioned to J.

We begin, then, by remarking that it is not right to speak of the first two chapters as duplicate narratives, for there is a different purpose running through each of them. To put it broadly, we may say that in the first chapter the account of creation is given for its own sake, while in the second we merely have the setting for the story of the Fall, starting, not from a general creation, but from the making of man and the garden. Nor can it be said that there is any discrepancy between the two accounts, provided the general character of the first chapter be recognized, as it has been set forth, for example, by Father O'Hea, S.J., in another essay.

Again, the so-called 'second creation' does not really fit in with J, any more than the 'first creation' fits in with P. Whoever has carefully perused the article just mentioned will easily understand that there is nothing really like the first chapter of Genesis in the whole of the Pentateuch. It

[1] *Genesis*, Addenda ii. pp. xlv-xlvi.

[2] *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 23, 24.

is a unique opening to a unique book. The rhythmical and symmetrical character peculiar to it does not recur in P, but renders the chapter much more different from the rest of P than the rest of P is from J. To speak of the rest of P as 'homogeneous in style and character with Genesis i. 1-ii. 4*a*' [1] is to betray astounding literary obtuseness.

As regards the 'second creation,' we have already remarked how awkwardly, on the critics' hypothesis, it is joined to the first. The use of 'Lord God' compels them to assign the second part of Genesis ii. 4 to J, which follows on, but the word 'generations,' which precedes, is considered a characteristic P word, and therefore must refer to what precedes. This it may well do in any case; but because the formula, 'These are the generations,' usually precedes the account to which it belongs, Driver (*ad loc.*) notices favourably the desire of many critics to prefix Genesis ii. 4 (first half) to the whole book, and to assign its removal to the compiler—a glaring example of the lack of literary discernment so often displayed by the 'higher critics,' implying as it does an entire want of appreciation of the present magnificent opening. St. John the Evangelist had better felt its force: 'In the beginning God created . . .'; nay, 'In the beginning was the Word'!

But, in the 'second creation,' as a whole, it is the divine names that are especially at fault. Yahweh does not appear alone, even once, in the second or third chapters, but it is always either 'Yahweh Elohim' or 'Elohim,' the latter in Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5, contrary to the whole modern scheme. Further, 'Yahweh Elohim' simply, the latter without a pronominal suffix, is very generally considered an anomaly; the two names occur together twenty times up to the end of Genesis iii. but only very rarely elsewhere, and many scholars (e.g., Kittel in his Hebrew Bible, in the *apparatus* to Genesis ii. 4, and the Oxford Hebrew Dictionary, page 219) think, rightly enough, that one of the names should go. Only, according to the textual evidence, as Kittel makes clear, and as Wiener forcibly shows,[2] the latter, unfortunately, without any reference to the Old Latin, it is unquestionably 'Yahweh' that should be regarded as an interpolation, not merely because it is not found in Genesis iii. 1, 3, 5, but because in some other verses (Genesis ii. 9, 21), the Septuagint and Old Latin agree in ousting it, and there is other evidence

[1] Driver, *Genesis*, p. iv. [2] *Essay in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 29.

tending in the same direction, but none, I think, in favour of keeping ' Yahweh ' alone. The Old Latin may be seen in Dom Sabatier's great volumes (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, 1751), or in *Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, by John S. McIntosh (Chicago, 1912). Thus the use of the divine names in reality furnishes a damaging argument against the ' critical ' treatment of the first three chapters.

Passing from the use of the divine names to the use of ' characteristic words ' in general, we may still use these chapters to show the weakness of the ' critical ' contention, so far as it regards P. But first some remarks of a more general kind. No doubt a list of words truly characteristic of P can be compiled; but this was bound to be the case, given the peculiar nature of the passages assigned to P. As Wiener puts it,[1] ' the argument amounts to saying that in a technical passage technical terms are used.' If all that belongs to systematic chronology, liturgy, and the rest be relegated to P, it follows that terms which are chronological[1] liturgical, and so forth will abound there, and perhaps be found there only, and perhaps bring with them other less immediately technical terms. If the reader of a history of the present war were convinced that a special writer had been employed to describe the war by sea, he could easily prove it (if proof it were) by a list of words including such terms as ' submarine,' ' torpedo,' ' cruiser '; and on the same principles he might discover a separate source for the parts concerned with the war in the air, the war in Mesopotamia, and various other departments or aspects of the struggle. Such an argument from language, taken simply on its own merits, would be worthless. On the other hand, supposing that in the narration of *precisely similar* events there were paragraphs in which ' soldiers,' ' guns,' ' advanced,' and several other words were consistently used, and others in which ' Tommies,' ' cannon,' ' went forward,' and other alternative synonyms were employed with equal constancy—then we should be justified in at least suspecting that a compiler had made up his narrative from different sources.

Now, the words which Driver[2] gives as characteristic of P are evidently, in the main, words that belong to it in the very nature of the case, words consequently that are no criterion of origin. The first eight belong to the first chapter. To discuss these thoroughly would require much space, and

[1] *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 206. [2] *Genesis*, pp. viii-ix.

would be a great weariness to the reader. Perhaps the general drift of the rebutting argument will be sufficiently perceived when it is pointed out that (1) the word 'kind' (i.e., species, etc.), is used ten times in Genesis i., seven times in the Flood narrative, and nine times in the enumeration of Leviticus xi.; otherwise in the Old Testament only in Deuteronomy xiv. 13-18; Ezekiel xlvii. 10, neither of which passages, of course, belongs to P; (2) 'creep' and 'creeping things' are used seven times here, thirteen times in the Flood, and twice in Leviticus xi.; otherwise, in the Pentateuch, only in Leviticus xx. 25, Deuteronomy iv. 18, the latter once more not in P. Evidently we have here words needed only in a peculiar context, and, given the nature of the passages assigned to P, that context can hardly fail to be a P context. As we have said, to show the full force of this criticism of the 'characteristic words' of P would be intricate and tedious.

But it may be urged, these literary arguments about sources are only one side of the 'critical' case; there are duplicate narratives or precepts which differ, not merely in style, but also in content, so that they are in reality inconsistent. Well, as a matter of fact, we have already had occasion in this article to offer some criticism of the contention that Genesis opens with two inconsistent narratives of creation; and in another essay Father Baillon, S.J., writing of the Flood, incidentally demolishes the attempt to distinguish two inconsistent accounts of that episode. As regards the supposed stages of liturgical and sacerdotal development, culminating in P, which is supposed to read back into the age of Moses regulations which only came into force after the exile, Father Manning, S.J., in his essay, 'Wellhausen and the Levitical Priesthood,' to which we referred at the outset, has shown that even where Wellhausen appears most specious, the traditional view has nothing to fear from a sound and sane exegesis. To place P so late in the history only produces a fresh crop of difficulties. Thus enough has already been done to make it clear that the rationalist position—for such in truth it is—lies no less open to attack on its historical than on its literary side. And yet, surely, the *onus probandi*, the duty of justifying an attitude, lies in reality, not with us, but rather with those who depart from an age-long tradition, in denying unity and truth to a work that obviously claims it.

Indeed, as regards the truth of the matter, it appears safe to say that recent discoveries, such as those of Hammurabi's code, of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and of the Elephantine papyri, have in various ways strengthened the argument for the historical character of the Priestly Code. The rationalist position finds its *raison d'être*, not in historical evidence, but in an *a priori* evolutionary philosophy. However, it has been the object of this essay to examine, not into the trustworthiness of P, taken on its own merits, but into the need of separating it and constituting it an independent source, and that, again, in such a way as to discuss in detail only one particular instance or proof, though perhaps the most important.

Note.—In this essay an explanation is offered of Exodus vi 3, which would allow of the previous use of the name Yahweh, even in the same source. It may be worth while to point out, however, that this explanation is not strictly necessary to the argument, since it appears reasonably certain, as is shown later in the essay, that the name Yahweh should not appear in Genesis i-iii at all. A further study of the whole question may be found in the introduction to Dr. Hoberg's edition of Genesis (*Die Genesis*, Freiburg, Herder, 1908)

THE FLOOD.

THE Flood is one of the most interesting of the Bible problems. There is something which appeals to all, young and old alike, in a large flood, something that fascinates the onlooker and keeps him rooted to the spot, unable to turn away to less interesting but possibly important duties. And the bigger the flood the more interesting it is, even to those who can only read about it and are not able to see it for themselves. But when we read in the Bible of a flood which covered the tops of all the high mountains under the whole heaven and destroyed all living creatures, our interest is still more increased by the question how to account for the extraordinary facts which underlie the simple and apparently literal account given in Genesis.

To the ordinary Catholic layman—the Catholic man in the street, who knows nothing of Bible exegesis, and who from his childhood has, without further thought, regarded the universality of the Flood almost as a dogma of faith—it must come with something of a shock when he hears that it is probable that the Flood did not cover the whole world, though it is very likely that, with the exception of Noah and his family, the whole human race was destroyed.

Yet such is the view of even conservative Catholic commentators to-day, and the object of this essay is to sketch briefly the reasons for holding such an opinion, of course with all possible respect for the authority of the Church, to which belongs the final decision in the matter. There are difficulties against *any* view that may be taken of the Flood, and difficulties which are practically insoluble, owing to the scantiness of the data which we possess. But while Tradition and Scripture themselves do not demand a universal Flood, the difficulties against this view are far greater than those against a partial Flood.

The sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Genesis give the story. The Flood was the manifestation of God's anger against the human race for its wickedness. The whole narrative abounds with repetitions, as is usually the case in Semitic writings. In chapter vi. Noah is ordered to build the Ark and to take into it his family and the animals, by pairs, with food for all. Then in chapter vii. he is again told to go into the Ark, taking seven pairs of each clean and two pairs of each unclean animal. He obeys the command, and human beings and animals enter ' two by two ' (such is probably the right interpretation), after him. The Flood rises for forty days till it covers the highest mountains by fifteen cubits and destroys all living creation under heaven. For a hundred and fifty days it remains at its full height, and then gradually sinks until the Ark grounds on the mountains of Armenia. A good many days elapse before the earth dries, and when Noah once more steps on *terra firma* he has spent one year and ten days in the Ark.

Such is, in short, the account of the Flood. The details are very minute, both as to the building of the Ark and its equipment, and as to chronology.

The first question which naturally arises when we attempt to probe the account of Genesis is, why did the author go into such minute details, and from what source did he get his information? The reason for the minutiæ is evident. Moses had for his primary object in writing Genesis the religious instruction of the people of Israel, and in drawing such a vivid picture of the destruction of mankind, he wished to put before them, and to bring home to them, the magnitude of the punishment which God in His righteous anger inflicted on men for their sins. With regard to the sources from which the account was taken, we must assume the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The documentary hypothesis (first proposed by Astruc at the end of the eighteenth century and elaborated very considerably of recent years by Wellhausen and his school) cannot be entered into here. This is an ingenious attempt to parcel out the Pentateuch into narratives of different writers, the latest of whom incorporated the earlier narratives into his own work, and wrote his part, even of the very earliest days of mankind, as though the full religion of his time had existed from the beginning. It can only be pointed out here that the Babylonian parallels, of which something will be said presently, are completely against

it: the Babylonian story offers a single compact narrative reflecting, not the Yahvist source (J.) nor the Priestly Code (P.) alone, but both impartially. We may also notice in passing that the supposed discrepancy between P. and J. as to the duration of the Flood, put forward, for example, by the late Professor Driver,[1] is purely fictitious, as we shall show later. The question, however, remains as to the sources from which Moses drew his information.

A tradition of some sort of a deluge or flood which destroyed all mankind, or nearly all, is to be found among many nations and tribes. In most of these traditions the fact that the Flood was a chastisement from God has been forgotten; this, however, is to be expected. Professor Driver remarks[2] that flood-stories 'are not found (according to Andrée) in Northern and Central Asia; they are also absent in Egypt, China, and Japan, and almost absent in other parts of Africa (except where they are due to Christian influence).' It is a question whether this be not too sweeping an exclusion, but it is difficult to be sure of the truth, and we do not press the point; the great fact remains that the memory of the catastrophe lives in the traditions of men. Many of the ancient nations have preserved this tradition in their hieroglyphics: this is especially the case in the picture-writings of Mexico and Peru, and the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions.

The chief Babylonian narrative is contained in an epic relating to the doings of Gilgamesh, the hero of Uruk (the Erech of Genesis x. 10). Gilgamesh's ancestor, Ut-Napishtim, has received the gift of immortality, and Gilgamesh, naturally anxious to obtain the same gift, sets out to visit him. After crossing the waters of Death—the ocean encircling the world—he finds Ut-Napishtim unchanged by age and immortal. The latter relates how, as a reward for his piety, he was preserved from death at the time of the great Flood and subsequently made immortal by the god Bel. There is such a striking resemblance in substance with the Biblical narrative that some lines may be quoted. Bel and some other gods had determined to destroy Shurippah, a city on the Euphrates, and Ea, the lord of wisdom, warns Ut-Napishtim to escape by building a great

[1] *Genesis*, p. 85.

[2] Ibid., pp. 101, 102.

ship. We take the translation given by Professor Driver :—

O Man of Shurippah, Son of Ubaratutu,
Frame a house, build a ship. . . .
Bring up into the midst of the ship the seed of life of every sort.
For the ship which thou shalt build
Let its form be long,
And its breadth and its height shall be of the same measure.
Upon the deep then launch it.

Later follows the building of the ship, which differs somewhat from the Ark :—

On the fifth day I began to construct the frame of the ship.
In its hull, its sides were 120 cubits high
And its deck was likewise 120 cubits in breadth.
I built on the bow and fastened all firmly together.
Then I built six decks in it,
So that it was divided into seven storeys.
The interior of each storey I divided into nine compartments.
I drove in plugs (to fill up crevices),
I looked out a mast and added all that was needful.
Six jars of bitumen I spread over it for caulking;
Three jars of naphtha I took on board.

He then enters the ship with his family, servants, and possessions and the animals, and the Flood commences :—

I feared to look upon the earth,
I entered within the ship and closed my door.
Six days and nights
Raged wind, deluge, and storm upon the earth.
When the seventh day arrived the storm and deluge ceased,
Which had fought like a host of men;
The sea was calm, hurricane and deluge ceased;
I beheld the land and cried aloud:
For the whole of mankind was turned to clay.

The ship then landed on Nisir, a mountain east of the Tigris, and after seven days,

I brought forth a dove and let it go;
The dove went to and fro;
As there was no resting-place, it turned back.
I brought forth a swallow and let it go;
The swallow went to and fro;
As there was no resting-place, it turned back.
I brought forth a raven and let it go,
The raven went, and saw the decrease of the waters;
It ate, it waded, it croaked, it turned not back.

He then left his ship and, like Noah, offered sacrifice :—

Then I sent forth (everything) towards the four winds (of heaven).
I offered sacrifice;
I prepared an offering on the summit of the mountain.
I set Adugur-vases seven by seven,
Underneath them I cast down reeds, cedar wood, and incense.
The gods smelt the savour,
The gods smelt the goodly savour;
The gods gathered like flies over the sacrificer.

There are certainly differences in detail, but the general greement between the whole account and that of Genesis eems to point clearly to a common source. This parallel is ery valuable, and tells strongly against the ' documentary ' ypothesis, namely, that the Biblical account is a medley uilt up of unknown documents by different authors. It oints to a single and detailed tradition as the original source. his course may well have been distorted by polytheism in ourse of time, for the ancestors of the Jews, as the Bible tself tells us (Josue xxiv. 2, 3; Judith v. 6-9), were idolaters; nd Moses may have purified it when writing his work under he influence of inspiration.

We can conclude, therefore, that Moses obtained the account of the Flood from the tradition handed down by the descendants of Noah, at first no doubt by oral tradition, later on by writing, and that the Babylonian parallel, derived from the same oral or written tradition, was gradually debased by the idolatry of the times. Thus the similarities and differences of the two accounts are easily and naturally accounted for.

This view is confirmed by the fact that in reality there are many Babylonian stories of the Flood, differing in some cases among themselves; as had been said above, we have merely taken the chief. Others may be seen in Rogers.[1] Another, a pre-Semitic account, has been edited by Dr. Stephen Langdon for the University of Pennsylvania.[2] The name Noah (Nuhu) is said to occur, and it is said to be Noah also (not Adam) who falls—the first reference to the Fall in Babylonian literature.

The question now arises, what sort of a flood is required to harmonise with the Biblical account, and at the same time

[1] *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, pp. 103-121.

[2] *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise*, Philadelphia, 1915; see especially pp. 5-7, 66-9.

to square with physical facts and possibilities? It was said at the beginning of this paper that most likely the Flood was not universal, geographically, but limited to a portion of the earth. Up to the seventeenth century, it is true, everybody thought the Flood covered the whole earth; the account of Genesis at first sight seemed to demand this, and the Fathers took it for granted; but it must be remembered that up to comparatively recent times the world was regarded as being very much smaller than it is, comprising only Europe and certain portions of Asia and Africa. Some old maps of the world, even of the ninth and the tenth centuries, teach us how very ingeniously our ancestors conceived the known world, joining Europe and strips of Asia and Africa into one small very solid-looking continent, the whole surrounded by the great ocean which bounded the earth.

We must attack this question from the Catholic's point of view, to see whether we may hold a partial Flood; and then from the physical side. The account in Genesis says that ' all the high hills which were under the whole heaven were covered.' This seems to indicate that the waters rose above the peaks of all the mountains of the world. But by taking parallel passages we see at once that such expressions may bear a very limited meaning. In both the Old and New Testaments, the whole is very frequently put for the part. Thus, at the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel, we read that a decree went forth from Augustus that the whole world should be enrolled. At the time of Pentecost, the Acts tell us that devout Jews had gathered together out of every nation under heaven, and yet when these nations are enumerated they are very few, and chiefly those dwelling near Palestine. Again, the Gospel was preached immediately after Pentecost ' to every creature under heaven '; and in the Old Testament we read that ' all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn.' Many similar quotations could be given to show that the words used in Genesis can be taken of a single locality.

Scripture does not, then, require the whole world to have been covered by the Flood. We can interpret Genesis easily to mean a partial Flood. It must be admitted that the Fathers suppose the former, but their consensus here is not Tradition in the strict sense. On this point we cannot do better than quote from the admirable commentary on Genesis published in 1910 by the learned Capuchin, Father Hetzenauer, Professor of Exegesis at the Papal Seminary of

St. Apollinaris, Rome (pp. 169, 170). We translate from the Latin :—

It is true that the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes of the Church, up to the seventeenth century, commonly taught the geographical universality of the Flood; but their doctrine on this point is not Tradition in the strict sense. We must carefully distinguish. If the Fathers teach anything with a unanimous consensus, and, moreover, *as belonging to faith or morals* (Leo XIII), or if, directly or indirectly, they put forward the explanations which they give *as the sense of the Church*, then their unanimous consensus shows the true Tradition of the Church and the true sense of the Bible, and is binding upon all Catholic exegetes. But if they explain some passage of the Bible with, it is true, a unanimous consensus, but neither directly nor indirectly put forward this explanation as the sense of the Church, then we have the common opinion of the teachers of those times, but not Tradition in the strict sense. And we can desert such a private opinion of the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes, as Leo XIII and Pius X show us. Now, the Fathers, neither directly nor indirectly, put forward the geographical universality of the Flood as the sense of the Church, or as a doctrine of faith or morals; therefore Tradition in the strict sense does not teach this universality.

Turning now to scientific facts, we see that the difficulties against a universal Flood are overwhelming, while a partial Flood, though also demanding some sort of divine intervention, can be much more easily accounted for. The difficulties may be classed under physics, zoology, and geology. To take the physical difficulty first. For clearness' sake, and also because it has some bearing on the 'documentary' hypothesis (cf. pp. 22-3), it may be well here to say a few words as to the duration of the Flood. We have given us a chronology, both by months and by days, of which only the former is really complete, and so available for calculation :—

I.—*Enumeration by months.*

2*nd month*, 17*th day* (600th year of Noah) : Flood begins (Gen. vii. 11).

7*th month*, 17*th day* : Ark rests on mountains of Ararat; the decrease has begun (Gen. viii. 3, 4).

10*th month*, 1*st day* : the tops of the mountains are seen (Gen. viii. 5).

1*st month*, 1*st day* (next year, 601st year of Noah) : waters dried up from off the earth (Gen. viii. 13).

2*nd month*, 27*th day* : the earth is dry (Gen. viii. 14). The full duration of the Flood is thus a year and ten days, i.e., 370 days in all.

II.—*Enumeration by Days.*

(1) 40 *days and nights*: the rain falls (Gen. vii. 4, 12); in the latter verse the Douay 'the rain *fell* upon the earth' is more accurate than the Authorised and Revised 'the rain *was* upon the earth.'

(2) 150 *days*: the waters prevail (Gen. vii. 24; viii. 3). These 150 days are the five months (of 30 days) of the preceding table, and *include* the 40 days. The five months give the outside limit, so that 190 days are impossible.

(3) 40 *days and* 21 *days*: the waters decrease (Gen. viii. 6-12). These 61 days are enumerated, not from the end of the above 150 days, but apparently from the tenth month, first day (Gen. viii. 5). Noah is already high and dry, and the tops of the mountains are appearing. The end of the 61 days coincides with the first month, first day (Gen. viii. 13), counting in both days, and reckoning 30 days to the month.

To come now to the difficulty. We must concede, if a literal interpretation of Genesis is to be followed, that the Flood not only covered the mountains of Armenia on which the Ark landed, but the far higher peaks of India and America. Now, the Flood took forty days to rise to its full height and 220 days to dry up completely. A simple calculation, based on the size of the earth, the height of Mount Everest, and the Biblical chronology of the Flood give us some interesting facts. The rate at which the water must necessarily have risen to cover Mount Everest in forty days and nights would have the incredible value of, roughly, 360 inches an hour! To give some idea of what this means. St. Beuno's College, where the first draught of this essay was written, is at an elevation of 490 feet, and would have been submerged in seventeen hours; and had the Ark been in its vicinity, it would have floated over our neighbouring hill, Maen Epha, in well under two days, and the only place of refuge in Wales in five days would have been the very summit of Snowdon. Again, the amount of water required for the complete deluge would have been three million million million tons. Where did all this water come from? The rate at which the water would have to evaporate, or otherwise disappear, for the earth to dry up in 220 days, may be illustrated by the fact that at the same rate the Atlantic Ocean would disappear in about three months, and an army could walk dry-shod from Lincolnshire to Holland after twenty hours. The production of this huge volume of water and the rates

at which it would have to appear and to be removed from the earth are impossible from a physical standpoint. No doubt Almighty God might work a great miracle of this kind; but a proper reverence demands that in the matter of miracles we should respect the axiom, 'entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate.' Divine interventions of this tremendous character are not to be postulated easily, but only where the theological (or physical) evidence supplies strong reasons. Hence, even to the most devout Catholic—perhaps, indeed, more especially to such a one—the considerations which we have just alleged must appear to tell against a universal Flood. But there is other evidence of a more direct kind.

Geology and zoology also present their difficulties. Palæontology tells us that even in the Tertiary Epoch the number of species of animals was immense. Father Hetzenauer, already quoted, calculates that over 40,000 animals would have had to be stowed away in the Ark. How could room possibly be found for them? We do not know exactly what the size of the Ark was, owing to the precise length of the cubit being unknown. Assuming this to be about eighteen inches, the Ark would be a very fair-sized vessel—450 feet long, 75 feet broad, 45 feet high—but if seven pairs of clean and two of unclean animals, or even only two pairs of each had to be accommodated, the size of the Ark, according to the measurements given in the Bible, would be utterly inadequate.

Again, as Schanz remarks, to suppose that the animals while in the Ark abstained from propagation is a triumph of ingenuous credulity over common sense. If we put the progeny of each pair in the Ark at four, a very moderate estimate, the numbers, even excluding any propagation among the descendants, would be very largely increased.

Other difficulties about the animals, as, for example, how those peculiar to distant and separated continents came to the Ark and afterwards returned, how herbiferous animals found food when turned loose from the Ark on the mud-covered surface of the earth, destitute of any trace of vegetation, must be passed over.

The existence of the cones of extinct volcanoes of the greatest antiquity show no traces or signs of the denuding action of a great flood, nor can any trace of the terrible catastrophe, which must have destroyed at least three-quarters of the vegetation of the earth, be found by botanists. These facts, however, must also be passed over, and we must

consider whether a partial or local Flood is possible which can fulfil all the conditions required by the Biblical account. At the present time Catholic commentators such as Hummelauer, Hetzenauer, Zorell, Reusch, Vigouroux, and Neteler all favour this explanation, though the last named brings forward an argument that will hardly convince any but the most credulous. He argues against the universality of the Flood from the fact that Paradise could not have been inundated, as the prophet Enoch, who is not yet dead, resided there[1].

The possibility of a partial Flood is not contradicted by Scripture, nor is it open to such great physical difficulties as a universal deluge. If we consider that Moses, when writing his account, looked at the Flood from the point of view of the eye-witness Noah, all becomes plain with regard to the apparent emphatic statements of the universality of the Flood. A very great local flood rises: all things perish, with the exception of those taken into the Ark. To Noah, secure in the Ark in the centre of the inundated region, the whole world *is* flooded—Noah's world of experience; and the waters *do* cover the tops of all the highest mountains—those, namely, in the region flooded and which were probably the only ones known to Noah. Here we come to the second great question, namely, the anthropological universality of the Flood. If we hold that the Flood was partial as to extent, what are we to say concerning its universality with regard to mankind?

We have no certain date at which to fix the Flood, and are completely in the dark as to the population of the world at the time: nor do we know how far they had spread over the face of the earth. If the number of human beings was still comparatively small, and they had not yet dispersed to any great extent, a partial Flood could easily destroy them all. But if they had multiplied greatly, and had already spread over the whole face of the earth, we must either give up the partial Flood, or say it was not universal with respect to mankind. The latter supposition, however, we can hardly hold, and must say that it is most likely that the entire race was destroyed. Both Scripture and Tradition seem to demand this. The expressions in the Bible such as *homo*, *universa caro*, *universi homines*, etc., are very general, and there are not the same reasons for giving them a limited application as in the case of the beasts and the material world. The Flood was sent to punish all sinners and God repented that He had made man. But these sinners were the whole

human race, *omnis caro*, which would seem to require that the Flood destroyed all men. Then in Genesis ix. 19, we are told that the whole race springs from the three sons of Noah;[1] and in the same chapter God made a covenant with Noah and promised not to send another flood to destroy all men. But He would seem to have been false to His promise if the great Flood did not exterminate the race, for there have been many terrible floods since which have destroyed countless lives. In addition to these and similar reasons, derived chiefly from the Epistles of St. Peter, we have the universal and constant Tradition of the Church, which holds up the universality of the Flood as the essential part of one of the great types, known to all, and closely connected with the Faith—for the Ark could not be a type of the Church, *extra quam nulla salus*, if others besides those in the Ark had escaped death. But all these reasons do not give us certainty. The Church has shown her mind on the subject in her teaching, but not by any decision or definition, while the Fathers give their explanations not as the sense of the Church, nor as a dogma of faith, but as an opinion *connected* with the Faith. For these reasons, which he sets forth at greater length, Father Hetzenaeur is content to lay it down[2] that *universalitas anthropologica* (*diluvii*) *probabilissima est;* and we cannot do better than follow such a reliable guide. The chief reasons alleged by those modern commentators who wish to limit the effect of the Flood on mankind are based on anthropological and philological facts. They say that if all the existing races sprang from Noah and his family, the great racial differences, as, for instance, between Negroes and Indo-Europeans cannot be accounted for in the short time that elapsed between the Flood and the most ancient Egyptian monuments in which the negro is always depicted with the same well-defined characteristics he possesses to-day. A similar difficulty holds as regards language, but to do justice to this we should have to discuss the whole question of 'the Tower of Babel.' These objections, however, are not to the point. It must be held in mind that we have no certain chronology in regard to the Flood. We can put it back to a sufficiently remote date to account for all differences in ethnological characteristics. It is practically certain that the Biblical genealogies are very incomplete and represent

[1] Literally, 'from these dispersed all the earth'; a compendious expression, not quite as strong as might at first sight appear.

[2] In *Gen.*, p. 172.

possibly but a small number of the individuals in the line of descent. The fact, too, that undeniable traces of civilisation and culture among the Egyptians and Babylonians can apparently be followed to at least 4000 B.C. makes the date of the Flood, calculated simply and directly from the genealogies of the patriarchs, practically impossible.

To conclude: let us see whether it is possible to give a consistent account of a partial Flood that will satisfy all the Biblical requirements and at the same time be in accordance with the demands of science. A plausible one is quoted by Father Brennan from Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks* in his *Science of the Bible* (*ad fin.*). It is too long to be given here *in extenso*, but may be condensed as follows: There is a region in the west of Asia and the extreme east of Europe, nearly equal in extent to the area of Europe, where rivers such as the Volga and the Ural are all turned inwards and flow into inland lakes or seas, such as the Caspian or that of Aral. In the whole of this region there are very large tracts of land under the level of the ocean. The shore line of the Caspian, for example, is 83 feet below the level of the Black Sea, while the Steppes around are 30 or more feet below the level of the Baltic. Now, what is known as the Low Steppes of the Caucasus, lying roughly between the Caspian and the Persian Gulf, is a tract or shallow of great area, very low-lying and having Mount Ararat,[1] one of the mountains of Armenia, on its western edge. This region forms a great part of the recognised centre of the early human race. If we suppose, then, that the human family, amounting to many millions, were gathered in this region, beyond which it is quite possible to suppose they had not yet strayed, and that the land began to sink gradually; and if we suppose that this sinking process went on for forty days and nights at the rate of 400 feet per day—a rate which would be imperceptible to the inhabitants and would exhibit itself merely as a persistent rising of the sea—and if, as the result of such a depression, torrential rains and thunderstorms continued during the whole time, we have all that is required for a partial Flood which would destroy all mankind. The rain, though in reality affecting

[1] It should be explained that there is no 'Mount Ararat' in the Bible (Gen. viii. 4) but only the 'mountains of Ararat,' Ararat being the Urartu often mentioned in the Assyrian records. The present 'Mount Ararat,' however, is a lofty peak among the 'mountains of Ararat,' and possibly, indeed, the peak intended by the writer.

little the extraordinary rise of the waters, would *appear* to be its main cause, tearing down the hillsides in great cataracts and swelling the rivers, while a depression extending from the Euxine Sea and the Persian Gulf to the Gulf of Finland might open up by three channels the fountains of the great deep. At the end of forty days the depressed area would be sunk in its centre to a depth of 16,000 feet—a depth which would cover all the mountains of the district, and yet having a gradient of only sixteen feet per mile would leave the general contours of the hills and plains apparently as before. When the Flood at length began to subside by the gradual rising again of the sunken area and the Ark grounded on the mountains of Armenia, the view from the upper window would have been a boundless sea flowing away towards the distant oceans. Noah would see that ' the fountains of the deep were stopped ' and the waters running from off the face of the earth continually—to him it would certainly have appeared a Flood which had covered the whole face of the earth.

Here the question must be left—and it must be left unsolved. That all mankind perished seems to be by far the safer view in consideration of the weight of Tradition and the definite teaching of the Bible : that there was but a local, though a very considerable, Flood is the view that seems to be as easily deducible from the Old Testament as the alternative view of a universal Flood, while it avoids many of the very serious physical and other difficulties that otherwise have to be faced. In any case, a great miracle has to be admitted; but even if it were absolutely necessary to postulate a whole series of stupendous miracles, as would seem to be required if the Flood covered the whole world, Catholics would not be afraid of them.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

One of the chief arguments used by the early Christian apologists was that the civilization of the Hebrews, through whom came Christianity, was far more ancient than that of the Greeks, at that time reputed to be the oldest of all civilizations. They maintained that Greek literature and Greek writers were young compared with those of the Hebrews: Moses was more ancient than Homer and all the philosophers and poets. Tatian, in his *Oratio ad Graecos* (c. 40), sums up the argument as follows :—

> Therefore, from what has been said, it is evident that Moses was older than the ancient heroes, wars, and demons. And we ought rather to believe him, who stands before them in point of age, than the Greeks, who, without being aware of it, drew his doctrines as from a fountain. For many of the sophists among them . . . endeavoured to adulterate whatever they learned from Moses, . . . first, that they might be considered as having something of their own, and secondly, that covering up by a certain rhetorical artifice whatever things they did not understand, they might misrepresent the truth as if it were a fable.

But the research and discoveries of recent times have brought to light literatures and civilizations far older than those of the Hebrews, so that now our apologists find the old argument turned against them by anti-Christian writers. Many problems are thus raised, but it is our intention to confine ourselves to that of the antiquity of man, a problem largely affecting our interpretation of some points of the book of Genesis.

In the discussion of this subject it seems better to begin by examining information from sources external to the Bible, as this information is in some respects clearer. These sources are historical, geological, and archæological. For all historical evidence of ancient man we must go to the records of the earliest civilizations of which we have knowledge; these are, the Egyptian and Babylonian. How far back will the

records of these ancient empires take us? As the ancient history of the banks of the Nile is the better known we will begin with Egypt.

Up to the 18th dynasty the divergence in dates is small, in fact almost negligible. Professor Petrie of Oxford assigns to this dynasty the years 1587-1327 B.C.,[1] Breasted 1580-1358 B.C., and Meyer 1600 B.C. For the 12th dynasty these same authorities give, respectively: Petrie 2778-2565 B.C. —but in his *Researches in Sinai* (1906) he has raised this to 3459-3246 B.C.—and Breasted and Meyer 2000-1788 B.C. It is impossible in the restricted limits of this essay to explain in full the causes of this very great divergence.[2]

With the 4th dynasty we are still on historical ground, the monuments of Snefreu, the first king of this dynasty, and of his subjects being well known. To this dynasty Meyer assigns the years 2840-2680 B.C., Breasted 2900-2750 B.C., and Petrie 4731-4454 B.C. (formerly 3928-3721 B.C.). The pyramids belong to the 4th dynasty. The labour of quarrying the huge blocks of stone was not only immense but required a high degree of skill; and the remarkable finish of the sculptures and paintings and other objects of art of this same period points to an advanced stage of civilization.

Of the three first dynasties very little is known, hence many dates assigned to them must at present be purely conjectural. Still, conjectures are made: Petrie's being for Menes, the supposed founder of the first Egyptian dynasty, 5510 B.C. (formerly 4777 B.C.); Meyer's 3315 B.C., and Breasted's about 3400 B.C. In 1897 the tomb of Menes—if indeed this is his real name [3]—was discovered by de Morgan at Nakada. Here, again, the beauty of the objects of art, such as statuettes, incised ivory, etc., attests a high degree of culture.

Nor is this all. Excavations carried on between 1894-1901 brought to light remains of a pre-dynastic period extending to at least 700-800 years before Menes. These remains give proof that the inhabitants of the Nile valley possessed great skill in fashioning flint into all kinds of implements, weapons, etc., and that they were not ignorant of the manu-

[1] Flinders Petrie, *A History of Egypt* (1895), ii. p. 29. The dates for Egyptian Chronology are conveniently summed up in S. R. Driver's *Genesis* (1913), Chronological Table.

[2] For a fuller explanation, see Driver, *Addenda*, p.p. 17 ff.

[3] Cf. Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, ed. 5 (1910), p. 232D.

facture of pottery. According to Sir John Evans, the leading authority in England on archaic stone implements, these flints belong to the ' Neolithic ' period, i.e., the period which immediately preceded the use of metal, and during which working in stone reached its highest perfection. He concludes that the Neolithic age cannot have come to its close later than 5000 B.C.[1]

The difficulties of obtaining exact chronological data from the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, although very great, are not quite so great as in the Nile valley. At the early dawn of history the lower regions of these two rivers were occupied by a number of city kings, the people themselves being Sumerian, and apparently of a Mongolian type. From these king-cities the kingdoms of Sumer and Akkad arose, destined finally to form the chief part of the Babylonian Empire.

Calculations, based on recent discoveries, show, with very great probability, that the first Babylonian dynasty commenced between the years 2240-2220 B.C. Mr. Leonard King, of the British Museum, gives the year 2225 B.C., and Father Deimel, S.J., Professor of Assyriology at the Biblical Institute, 2234 B.C.[2] This result is based chiefly on chronological references to early rulers, which occur in the historical texts of the later Assyrian and Babylonian kings. Space prohibits the discussion of any of these references. But a few years ago a new method, an astronomical method, of arriving at the date of the first dynasty was hit upon by Father Kugler, S.J.—an argument quoted with great respect and freely used by King. It is completely independent of traditions and chronological references, and strikingly, although of course only approximately, it confirms the above-stated dates. It is based on some discovered tablets recording a series of astronomical omens derived from observations of the heliacal rising and setting of Venus.

It was not until the reign of Hammurabi, the sixth king of the first Babylonian dynasty, that the whole of the lower Euphrates and Tigris was brought under the rule of one man.

---

[1] *The Antiquity of Man, with especial reference to the Stone Age in Egypt*, pp. 13, 14.

[2] For these dates for Babylonian Chronology see Fr. Deimel, S.J., *Vet. Test. Chronologia*, and L. W. King, *A History of Babylon* (1915), and *A History of Sumer and Akkad* (1910).

According to Mr. King, Hammurabi reigned from 2123-2081 B.C.; or according to Father Deimel, from 2132-2089 B.C. Previous to this final unification various dynasties reigned contemporaneously in the more powerful of the king-cities, those able to make subject to themselves smaller neighbouring cities. Preceding and partly contemporaneous with the first Babylonian dynasty were the dynasties of Nisin and Larsa, founded respectively about 2339 B.C. and 2335 B.C. Rim Sin, King of Larsa, captured Nisin about 2115 B.C., and Hammurabi himself captured Larsa about 2092 B.C.

The kingdom of Nisin destroyed and succeeded that of Ur. According to the Nippur dynastic lists the kingdom of Ur lasted 117 years, and therefore would have begun about 2456 B.C.

In the city of Lagash there ruled a long line of priest-chiefs or patesis. These patesis were anterior to and partly contemporaneous with the dynasty of Ur and other dynasties ruling in the regions of Sumer and Akkad. Lugalushumgal, the twelfth patesi of Lagash, was contemporaneous with Naram-Sin, the son and successor of the great Sargon or Shar-Gani-sharri of Akkad. Both Father Deimel and Mr. King place Sargon about 2650 B.C., thus questioning the correctness of the statement found on the cylinder of Nabonidus that Naram-Sin, son of Sargon, lived 3200 years before Nabonidus himself, which would make Sargon to be ruling *c.* 3800 B.C. To Ur-Nina, perhaps the chief founder of the patesis of Lagash, they give the date of 3000 B.C. instead of the earlier one, which would follow from the text of Nabonidus' cylinder. But Lugal-shag-engur was a still earlier patesi of Lagash and was contemporary with Mesilim, a king of Kish. It is impossible at present to assign a date to these two; but to the cylinder seals, tablets, and early graves found at Fara, a date scarcely less than 3400 B.C. can be given.

What justifies us in placing the origins of Sumerian civilization at a still earlier date is the fact that the cuneiform writing was already in existence when we first meet with this civilization. The earliest inscriptions recovered have already lost their pictorial form; we have a complete system of commerce, land estimated at corn value and a system of weights; public buildings are constructed and a stable form of government prevails. These early Sumerians were, in fact, already possessed of a high standard of civilization when we first met with them in Babylonia. The art of casting metals

existed—copper casts of a date earlier than Ur-Nina, patesi of Lagash, have been unearthed, thus denoting a bronze, or rather a copper age.

If, therefore, we take 4000 B.C.—and this is a low estimate—as the most far-off date for Babylonian history, and if we reckon an intervening period of but 1000 years to the Flood, we have the Flood taking place *c.* 5000 B.C., far earlier than what the Bible figures would lead us to believe. Add to this the number of years from the Deluge to Adam, which, to follow a probably incorrect method of treating the figures of the sacred text, is 1656 according to the Hebrew version and 2262 according to the Septuagint, and we have as a date for man's arrival on this earth something between 6500 and 7250 B.C.—a date which falls far short of that suggested by data supplied by geology and archæology.

It has been remarked that the problem of early man is, to a great extent, a matter of geology. The evolution of this science has not yet reached a stage capable of enabling us to state even approximately the age of man. With more or less certainty we can divide the history of the world into geological eras, and with fair accuracy assign a given rock-bed or stratum to its appropriate era; but when we come to express an era in terms of years we are met with a problem hitherto insuperable. It follows that the use of the word 'time' in connexion with geology is somewhat misleading.

Stratigraphically, geological time may be divided into Primary or Palæozoic, Secondary or Mesozoic, Tertiary or Cainozoic, and Quaternary or Post-Tertiary. In Primary and Secondary times there is no question of man, and the very best authorities confidently assert the same of Tertiary times. We need, therefore, consider only the fourth or Quaternary or Pleistocene or Glacial period, which brings us down to our own times.

It is now generally admitted that in the glacial epoch four periods of intense glaciation can be distinguished, with three milder intervals—we ourselves being in the fourth mild interval. How express these glacial periods, with their milder intervals, in terms of years? An answer to this question, combined with our knowledge of the sequence of strata in which remains of man and his handiwork have been found, would go far towards solving for us this problem of the antiquity of man. But how difficult this is with our present

knowledge, is evident from the fact that, while some attribute hundreds of thousands of years to the duration of the glacial epoch, others would restrict it to tens of thousands only. To arrive at a solution attempts have been made to discover some constant geological clock by the observation of processes that are shaping the world of to-day. Based on such a method there is a consensus of opinion that the mild interval, in which we are now living, has lasted from 7000-9000 years. Unfortunately, we can never be sure that the conditions have always been constant: in fact, everything points to the contrary. For instance, that it is no easy matter to gauge river-erosion is clear from the very different estimates arrived at in selected cases by different observers.

In 1842 Sir Charles Lyell made a guess, admittedly a guess, that the rate of erosion of the falls of Niagara could not be more than one foot per annum and probably not more than one-third of a foot. This would make the minimum age of the gorge 35,000 years, and the maximum 100,000 or more. But in 1907, from surveys and calculations, it was found that the rate of erosion for the past sixty-five years had been five feet per annum; so that, if the same forces had been at work continuously in the past which are operative at present, Niagara river would have eroded the whole gorge in about 7,000 years.[1] Similar results have been obtained with regard to the falls of St. Anthony at Minneapolis.

Professor Keith [2] thinks the Thames a 'reliable clock.' But the volume of water that flowed down its channel from the melting of the ice which, to an average depth of one mile, covered nearly the whole of England, must for many years have been greatly in excess of the volume which flows down to-day.

De Mortillet takes the glaciers as his geological clock. He calculated that the Rhone glacier would take 40,000 years to deposit its terminal moraine. But the Swiss glaciers are only degenerate descendants of their forefathers; and if the Rhone glacier had moved at the same rate as the present Hassanabad glacier was observed to have done in 1903, it would have covered the distance in thirty years instead of 40,000.

[1] See G. F. Wright, *The Origin and Antiquity of Man* (1913), p. 178.

[2] For these details from Keith, de Mortillet, and Penck, cf. Sir Bertram Windle, *A Century of Scientific Thought*, ch. 8.

A method recently discovered by Baron de Geer [1] holds out a prospect of far greater accuracy. De Geer counted the number of layers of sediment deposited by the melting ice during its last retreat from the south of Sweden to the present ice margin. Each layer probably corresponds to one summer's melting. Here, we can give no more than his results: 5,000 years for the retreat over the above-named portion of Scania, the southernmost part of Sweden; 7,000 years since the retreat came to an end, making, with a plausible guess of 5,000 years for the duration of retreat from the terminal moraine, deposited in the Baltic Provinces, to the south of Scania, 17,000 years since the beginning of the recession of the last advance of the great ice sheet.

How widely divergent are computations for the remainder of the glacial epoch is evidenced from the fact that whereas Penck would wish to assign as a minimum over half-a-million years to the whole of Pleistocene times, G. F. Wright [2] will not allow more than 80,000 years. From Penck's figures it would follow that the antiquity of man in Europe would be anything between 250,000 years and 500,000 years. And if we accept Keith's geological clock, the man of Galley Hill would have existed 200,000 years ago, and Neanderthal man from 500,000 to 1,500,000 years.

All archæological evidence of prehistoric man is necessarily connected with the age of the strata in which remains of man and his implements have been found. For Tertiary man there is no evidence approaching to certainty, but there are indubitable relics of Quaternary or glacial man.

If the Trinil remains, found in Java in 1891-2, are human, then they are the oldest of which we have knowledge. Their discoverer, M. Dubois, referred them to Pliocene times; but it is now asserted, and on very good authority, that they belong more probably to the early part of the Quarternary epoch. Whatever may be their date the greater number of the more capable judges refuse to credit them with being of human origin.

The Piltdown skull and the Heidelberg jaw are the oldest remains which can with certainty be classed as human. As to which must be given priority of age science is not yet able to inform us. The fauna and the flint implements found in

---

[1] For a short account of this method, see W. J. Sollas, *Ancient Hunters* (1915), pp. 561 ff.

[2] *The Origin and Antiquity of Man*, p. 200.

these same gravels suggest a Lower Palæolithic horizon. According to the Abbé Breuil they are possibly Chellean or pre-Chellean, an industry to which Professor Sollas assigns an age of from 27,000-32,000 years. As to the fauna found in the same Mauer Sands as the Heidelberg jaw, some would seem to indicate an Upper, some a Lower Palæolithic age, and others even a still earlier period.[1]

The linguistic argument, from the time required for the development of languages radically different, is not of such force as might at first sight appear; for languages most probably developed much more rapidly in prehistoric times, owing to the absence of the conservative influence of literature and civilization on linguistic evolution. The narrative of the Tower of Babel complicates somewhat the question of language, as the interpretation of this incident is not quite certain.

Neither does the consideration of differences of race necessarily compel us to assign a vast antiquity to man. Supporters of this argument appeal to the great permanence of type which racial varieties mostly exhibit. But observation has shown that influence of environment, spontaneous variations, and mixture of races can and do produce new types of men. In connexion with this influence of environment, Professor Franz Boas, speaking of the general results of his investigation of the physical characteristics of immigrants, undertaken for the United States Immigration Commission, says: 'These results are so definite that, while heretofore we had the right to assume that human types are stable, all the evidence is now in favour of a great plasticity of human types, and permanence of types in new surroundings appears rather as the exception than as the rule.'[2]

Let us now consider the figures of the Bible. The attempt to construct a chronology from these figures has produced estimates of the age of man far lower than what science leads us to believe. From the historical evidence given above we know that at 4000 B.C. the Flood was already a thing of the past.

Now, the generally accepted chronologies, based on the three most ancient versions of the original Pentateuch—the Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Septuagint—give

---

[1] Cf. W. J. Sollas, pp. 558, 56.

[2] Cf. Senate Documents, vol. 64: *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants.*

respectively 4157, 4243, 5328 years from the creation of Adam to the birth of Our Lord; 1656, 1307, 2242 A.M. as the year of the Flood; and 2136, 1921, 1921 A.M. for the call of Abraham.

We thus have what appears to be a most evident contradiction between the conclusions of science and the Bible narrative. But it follows from the doctrine of inspiration that the contradiction can be but apparent. Had we sufficient data it would be seen soon to disappear. But even with our present knowledge of the Bible text, have we any means of showing that this contradiction is, in fact, but apparent?

If we look at the fifth chapter of Genesis and compare the genealogical list of the antediluvian patriarchs with their respective years, as given in the three versions, we find a general agreement as to the total age of each patriarch, a less general agreement as to the number of years each patriarch lived after the birth of his son, the succeeding patriarch, and much disparity as to the age of each patriarch at the time of the birth of his son, the Septuagint version almost consistently adding a hundred years. And with regard to the genealogical list of postdiluvian partiarchs given in Genesis (chapter xi.), we find that the figures for the age of each and for the number of years he lived after the birth of his son are in general disagreement, although this disagreement rarely exceeds one hundred years. But with respect to the age of each patriarch at the birth of his son, the Samaritan and Septuagint versions are in almost complete accord as against the Hebrew version, both versions increasing the age by 100 years in the case of six patriarchs, by 50 or 100 in the case of Nachor, and giving the same figures in the case of the first and the last, Sem and Thare. The figures of each, therefore, cannot all be authentic; possibly none of them are, although the Hebrew version is generally considered as being the more accurate. It is evident that changes have been made in transcription. What these changes are and what are the true primitive figures it is impossible at present to say: perhaps it will ever be impossible. One explanation may be that the original text was in the cuneiform writing; in this script the addition of a few strokes may introduce an error of a hundred or even a thousand years. Or the figures may be implicit citations from pre-existing documents used by the author, who would not, therefore, guarantee their accuracy.

Again, did we but know the intention of the author in citing these figures, we should have at least a clue to a solu-

tion. Could this intention have been to give an exact chronology? It seems evident the Bible is not concerned with chronology. First, because the author is giving us the history of the chosen race out of which the Redeemer of mankind was to come, and chronology is no aid to salvation; secondly, because it is probable that there are omissions of names in these genealogical lists, whence it would also follow that the words *genuit* and *filius* are to be taken in a wide sense, and not necessarily as implying immediate generation or filiation.

In support of this we have but to compare Genesis xi. 12, 13, in the Hebrew version, with St. Luke's genealogy of Our Lord. According to the Hebrew version, 'Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and begot Sale'; but in St. Luke, following perhaps the Septuagint, we read: 'Sale *who was of Cainan*, who was of Arphaxad.' There are many other genealogical lists in the Bible in which it can be proved that one or more generations have been omitted. In the seventh chapter of the first book of Esdras, and in the sixth chapter of 1 Paralipomenon (Chronicles) the genealogy of Esdras is given, yet the genealogy as given in the book of Esdras omits as many as six consecutive names.

Again, St. Matthew, in his genealogical table of Our Lord's descent, says: 'Joram begot Ozias' whereas in reality Ozias was the great-great-grandson of Joram. From these examples, therefore, and from many others, it seems quite legitimate to postulate omissions in the genealogical lists of the patriarchs. Just as St. Matthew has several omissions in his genealogical table, probably with a view to having three series of fourteen names each, so may the genealogies of Genesis v. and xi. have been reduced symmetrically to ten antediluvian and ten postdiluvian generations.

If, then, the author of the Pentateuch had no intention of framing a chronology to span the time elapsed from Adam to Abraham, why is he so exact in stating the ages of the patriarchs? How are we to account for the great length of life he assigns to them, especially to those who existed before the Flood, all of whom, with the exception of Enoch, lived more than 770 years?

As usual, theories are not lacking to explain such phenomenal longevity.[1] Some avoid the difficulty by saying that the names do not stand for real persons. According to

[1] Cf. Fr. Hetzenauer, Ord. Cap., *Commentarius in Librum Genesis* (1910), p. 123.

Driver [1] they serve merely, in conjunction with the statements connected with them, to bring before the reader a general picture of primitive times as conceived by the writer. Was Adam, then, no real person? Others take them as representing nations. Yet we read of Lamech speaking to his two wives, Ada and Sella. Such an opinion is now obsolete, as also is the opinion which maintained that the years were not of twelve but fewer months. According to others they are individuals chosen to represent epochs. In connexion with this opinion it may be interesting to note that the sum of the ages of the patriarchs down to Abraham, along with the four thousand years that have elapsed since Abraham's time, would give an approximate age of mankind of about 15,000 years, a figure supported by some very good authorities. Catholic interpreters wishing to defend such longevity have advanced other explanations, as, for instance, the primitive excellence of the human body, the great sobriety in abstention from meat and wine; the first vigour of the earth, which imparted to its fruits greater power of sustenance; even the eating of the fruit of the tree of life by Adam, when in the Garden of Eden, communicating to his body a vitality which took many centuries before becoming exhausted Driver says that such longevity is physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body and could only have been attained under conditions altogether different from those existing to-day, and such as we are not warranted in assuming to have existed. Father Murillo, S.J., Professor at the Biblical Institute, in his book on Genesis, published in 1914 (page 347), brings forward some reasons for the contrary. It may seem easier to explain the difficulty by admitting a miracle on the part of God—perhaps that man might be propagated more rapidly, and that the original revelation and the history of the human race might be the better preserved and transmitted.

It is to be noted that the extraordinary duration of life of primitive man is guaranteed by Scripture itself and pagan tradition. Jacob, in his interview with Pharaoh (Genesis xlvii. 9), declares that his hundred and thirty years are few in comparison with those of his fathers. Manetho for the Egyptians, Berossus for the Chaldaeans, Mochus for the Phœnicians, and Hesiod, Hecate, Acusilaus, Ephorus and others for the Greeks, speak of the long life of ancient man.

[1] *Genesis*, p. 75.

With the Hindoos and the Chinese we find the same. The Zend-Avesta makes Yima, the first man, live more than three times three hundred years. It is the same with the aborigines of America, who relate that primitive men lived till their members were worn out.[1] Berossus, in particular, enumerates ten antediluvian Chaldean kings, whose combined reigns lasted for 120 sari, i.e., 432,000 years. Nevertheless, in spite of all the attempted solutions of the great age of the patriarchs, the question still remains open.

In conclusion, we may say that the evidence for estimates of hundreds of thousands of years for man's life on this earth, advanced by Keith, de Mortillet, Penck, and others, does not appear to rest on a sufficient basis; that, along with several good authorities, as Mr. G. F. Wright, we do not feel compelled to accept similar estimates of years attributed to the whole glacial epoch by these same scientists; and that we do not find altogether convincing the proofs for signs of man in the Tertiary era. We may go back, but with some reserve, to the earlier half of Quaternary times for the first traces of humanity. With the most moderate and the best archæological and geological authorities, such as the Abbé Breuil and Professor Sollas, we may place man, with very great probability—almost with certainty—in the third mild interval of the glacial epoch. According to these two eminent scientists man has an antiquity of at least something between 20,000 and 30,000 years, an estimate with which Driver agrees. M. Guibert [2] assigns 18,000 years as the maximum for man's life on this earth. Mr. G. F. Wright [3] says that it cannot be less than 10,000 years, and that 15,000 years amply satisfy the demands of all known geological and archæological evidence.

As the Bible makes no claim to furnish us with a chronology of prehistoric times—nowhere, in fact, in Scripture is the time that elapsed from the creation of Adam to Thare, the father of Abraham, computed, as it is from the descent of the Israelites into Egypt to the Exodus (Exodus xii. 40), or from the Exodus to the building of the Temple (3 Kings vi. 1)—we may rest assured that science will not discover in the future any data capable of impugning the veracity of the

---

[1] See Vigoroux, *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationaliste*, Vol. iv, ed. 3, pp. 226-7 (1891).

[2] Guibert, *In the Beginning*. Engl. trans. (1900), p. 377.

[3] *Origin and Antiquity of Man*, p. 490.

Bible in this matter of chronology, or the historical character of the first eleven chapters of Genesis. As Cardinal Meignan has written : ' It is an error to imagine that the Catholic faith encloses the existence of man within an interval of time which cannot exceed 6,000 years. The Church has never pronounced on so delicate a question.' [1]

Note.—In a letter on the ' Age of Ancient Man ' in the *Times* of Nov. 26, 1921, Prof. Ray Lankester insists upon the difficulty of separating a European Pleistocene ' gravel,' of distinguishing, even in Europe, Lower Pleistocene and Upper Pliocene, of connecting the geological history of distant lands, such as Java and South Africa, with that of Europe—in a word, upon the difficulty of coming to certain conclusions from the evidence as yet available.

[1] Cardinal Meignan, *Le Monde et l'Homme Primitif selon la Bible* (1869), p. 163. Cf. Vigouroux, *Manuel Biblique* (1913), i. p. 584.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

'My whole position is contained in my first chapter,' writes Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (p. 368); and since the biblical rationalists of our own time have made his position their own, it will be worth while to examine this first chapter with some care. This examination will to some extent run parallel to the examination of the fourth chapter, on the priests and Levites, which is to be found in another essay; but on the whole the discussion of 'the Place of Worship'—Wellhausen's title for this first chapter—proceeds on rather simpler lines. If, however, these two points can be satisfactorily dealt with from a conservative and Catholic standpoint, it is evident that the first part of Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*, the 'History of Worship,' loses all value, and his case falls to the ground. Indeed, as has already been seen, Wellhausen goes so far as to admit that all depends on the first chapter.

It is not necessary to explain the 'Documentary Hypothesis' once more, since this is done in the essay above referred to, and again in the essay on 'The Alleged Sources of Genesis i.-iii.' It will be enough to set forth this hypothesis so far as it immediately concerns us, and indeed this must be done at some length, for otherwise no criticism could be effectual. It may be premised in general that from a study of the prophets and of the books which he recognizes as in the main historical (chiefly Judges and the four books of Kings), Wellhausen professes to distinguish three main stages in the history of the 'Place of Worship'; and then, turning to the documents usually alleged to be the main sources of the Pentateuch, he finds three corresponding stages in the regulations dealing with the subject. To him, accordingly, these latter are not really Mosaic regulations, but belong to, and in a measure helped to produce, the historical stages to which they correspond. In the third section of the chapter he attempts to demolish the scriptural history of the tabernacle,

although in this matter, as we shall come to see, he has mistaken the husk for the kernel, which kernel is represented in this case by the ark of the Covenant.

It may help the student if references be given to Wellhausen's pages (English translation, 1885), and it should be understood that where quotation marks are used the *ipsissima verba* of the translation are reproduced; it was made, we are told on the title-page, under his supervision. He usually retains the Hebrew word *Bamah* (plural, *Bamoth*), rendered ' high places ' both in Protestant and Catholic versions; in this essay accordingly it will be convenient at times to follow his practice in this respect.

In the table of contents Wellhausen summarizes his first historical stage as follows: ' The historical and prophetical books show no trace in Hebrew antiquity of a sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy.' His view is, indeed, that in the primitive days anybody might sacrifice anywhere, and that every slaughter of an animal was a sacrifice. ' In the books of Judges and Samuel hardly a place is mentioned at which we have not at least casual mention of an altar and of sacrifice ' (p. 17). Some of these sacrificial seats were purely local, while some, especially that at Shiloh, were the object of pilgrimages from far and near. ' No king after Solomon is left uncensured for having tolerated the high places, but Samuel is permitted in his proper person to preside over a sacrificial feast at the Bamah of his native town, and Solomon at the beginning of his reign to institute a similar one at the great Bamah of Gibeon, without being blamed. . . The principle which guides this apparently unequal distribution of censure becomes clear from 3 Kings iii. 2: " The people sacrificed upon the high places, for as yet no house to the name of Jehovah had been built." Not until the house had been built to the name of Jehovah—such is the idea—did the law come into force which forbade having other places of worship besides ' (p. 19). ' For Israel properly so called, Jerusalem was at no time, properly speaking, the place which Jehovah had chosen; least of all was it so after the division of the kingdom. The Ephraimites . . . served Jehovah at Bethel and Dan, at Shechem and Samaria, at Penuel and Mizpah, and at many other places. Every town had its Bamah ' (p. 21). Elijah actually rebuilt the ruined altar on Carmel. ' Nobody had the faintest suspicion that such conduct was heretical and forbidden. . . Jehovah Himself was

regarded as the proper founder of all these sanctuaries ' (p. 22).

Even thus early, we must pause to offer several criticisms, before proceeding to the consideration of the second ' historical ' stage. Let us notice, to begin with, that even on Wellhausen's own showing the ' historical ' books of the Old Testament show a plain and consistent principle at work, which we shall see to be that of the supposed Pentateuchal documents also. We can but echo his own words : ' Not until the house had been built to the name of Jehovah—such is the idea—did the law come into force which forbade having other places of worship besides.'

And besides, he does not allow for the fact that the Bamoth were centres of idolatry. To judge from the way he writes, one would think that it was merely a question whether Yahweh was to be worshipped in one place or in several. Yet the evidence, even in the Books of Kings, clearly points the other way; one may study more especially 3 Kings xii. 25-33, xiii. 33-34; 4 Kings xvii. 7-17, xxii. 17, xxiii. 5-6, 10-15. Evidently this fact gives to the ultimate abolition of the Bamoth a totally different import from that imagined by Wellhausen. It was not merely that other centres of the worship of Yahweh became unlawful. The high places had early—in some cases from the beginning—become contaminated by cults in any case unlawful, so much so indeed that it is difficult to find in them the traces of a pure worship.

Finally, as we have seen, Wellhausen gratuitously assumes that in primitive days every slaughter was a sacrifice (p. 18). Now, that this was not the case *before* Moses, which is the main point, is clear from such passages as Genesis xviii. 7, xxvii. 9-14; that it was not the case *after* Moses is clear chiefly from Deuteronomy xii. 15. Doubtless Wellhausen and those that follow him would deny that this was valid evidence for the time before Josiah; but they cannot do this without a *petitio principii* until they have proved their whole case—this kind of thing is not following the evidence, but annihilating it. The book of Leviticus is the last place in the world, one would think, to which the ' critics ' would turn for a trustworthy record of primitive practice, but it also contains the one passage that at first sight supports them. Leviticus xvii. 3-4 commands that the killing of every ' ox or lamb or goat ' is to be ' an oblation to Yahweh before Yahweh's tabernacle ' ; doubtless this is an obvious and easy pre-

caution against idolatry in the wilderness, impossible of execution either before or afterwards.

The second historical stage is thus summarized in the table of contents: 'Polemic of the prophets against the sanctuaries. Fall of Samariah. Reformation of Josiah.' Amos and Hosea, we are told,

> presuppose a condition of matters just such as has been described: everywhere—in the towns, on the mountains, under green trees—a multitude of sanctuaries and altars, at which Jehovah is served in good faith. . . . The language held by these men (Amos and Hosea) was one hitherto unheard of when they declared that Gilgal, and Bethel, and Beersheba, Jehovah's favourite seats, were an abomination to him. . . . It would be to misunderstand the prophets to suppose that they took offence at the holy places . . . in and by themselves, on account of their being more than one, or not being the right ones. Their zeal is directed, not against the places, but against the cultus there carried on, and, in fact, not merely against its false character, as containing all manner of abuses, but almost more against itself, against the false value attached to it (p. 23).
>
> At the same time, in point of fact, it came about, as an incidental result of their teaching, that the high place of Jerusalem ultimately abolished all the other Bamoth. External circumstances contributed most essentially towards the result (p. 24).

These external circumstances consisted, in the first place, of the fall of Samaria. The temple had always dominated Judah, and now there was no longer any rival in Israel. Even before this the prophets had been more favourably disposed towards Jerusalem than towards the northern kingdom (Amos i. 2), and now they held that the ruin of the latter was a divine punishment, itself emphasized by the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib.

Even before completing Wellhausen's account of the second historical stage, it may be well to pause to notice what large concessions he is making. The language of Amos and Hosea, he tells us, 'was one hitherto unheard of'—yes, but, according to his view, theirs is the earliest evidence available, and to appeal to what was done or said 'hitherto' is to appeal from a well-attested state of affairs to a state of affairs for which, if Wellhausen be right, we have no evidence but his own *ipse dixit*. Once the prophets *are* there to speak, Wellhausen admits that they are far from taking his view of the matter, but declare Bethel and the rest an abomination to Yahweh. True, he tries to explain away their attitude, but, once more, he practically admits that his own view of the true significance of the prophets' invectives was not the view taken

at the time; they actually contributed powerfully to the disappearance of 'all the other Bamoth'! And, most significant of all, for Jerusalem, on the other hand, the prophets showed a marked partiality!

At the expense of a small digression, it may be well to point to a recent and glaring example of the violence that the 'critics' still do to the text of Amos, on whom Wellhausen lays stress, in order to bring it into conformity with their views. The hodge-podge in which the 're-arrangement' of this prophecy results in the *Westminster Commentaries*[1] must be seen to be believed; and the 're-arrangement' applies to date as well as to relative positions in the text. In Amos i. 2, it is said that 'the Lord shall roar from Sion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem'; but inasmuch as this savours too much of P it is rejected as a later addition. Wellhausen might have shown himself more tolerant as regards this verse (cf. above p. 50); but at least the rejection is in his spirit. Again, Amos v. 25-26 fairly obviously reproaches Israel with idolatry in the wilderness; but the former verse is taken by itself, 'the answer to the question is in the negative,' and therefore it is 'sufficient proof that Amos cannot have been acquainted with any document such as the Priestly Code' (p. 57). 'No sacrifices were required in the wilderness; nor are they wanted now' (p. 109). And so, when we come to the following verse, we are told that 'the difficulties attaching to this verse are almost insuperable' (p. 58)! Surely there is no overwhelming difficulty if we take the prophet to mean that, in the wilderness as now, the worship of Yahweh was mingled with idolatry. The expected negative reply, as in some other cases (e.g., 1 Kings i. 27-28), would be of a rhetorical character; it was *rather* idolatry than the worship of Yahweh that was practised in the wilderness. We may compare such negative *statements* as John vii. 16.

To return now to the second historical stage. Concerning King Hezekiah's attempt to abolish the high places, mentioned in 4 Kings xviii. 22 and elsewhere, Wellhausen expresses himself sceptically (p. 25). 'Not until about a century after the destruction of Samaria did men venture to draw the practical conclusion from the belief in the unique

[1] *The Book of Amos*, by E. A. Edghill; edited after Mr. Edghill's death by Dr. G. A. Cooke. These Westminster Commentaries (of which the best known is Driver's *Genesis*) must not be confounded with the *Westminster Version*.

character of the temple at Jerusalem. . . Prophets and priests appear to have made common cause in the prosecution of the work. It was the high priest Hilkiah who, in the first instance, called attention to the discovered book which was to be made the basis of action; the prophetess Huldah confirmed its divine contents ' (p. 26). To the prophets, it seems, the restriction of sacrifice was a welcome earnest of reform, and to the priests at Jerusalem, of course, a personal advantage. ' In the eighteenth year of Josiah, 621 B.C., the first heavy blow fell upon the local sacrificial places. How vigorously the king set to work, how new were the measures taken, and how deeply they cut, can be learned from the narrative of 4 Kings xxiii. Yet what a vitality did the green trees upon the high mountains still continue to show! Even now they were but polled, not uprooted ' (p. 27).

Without the Babylonian exile, in fact, Josiah's reform would not have succeeded, because of old associations. And so the third historical stage is summed up as ' Influence of the Babylonian exile.' The exile took the nation away for fifty years, ' a breach of historical continuity than which it is almost impossible to conceive a greater. . . From the exile there returned, not the nation, but a religious sect—those, namely, who had given themselves up body and soul to the reformation ideas. It is no wonder that to these people, who, besides, on their return, all settled in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, the thought never once occurred of restoring the local cults ' (p. 28).

It may be hoped that the reader now understands clearly what Wellhausen sets forth as the actual sequence of events. The corresponding legislative stages do not call for such detailed treatment. The first stage is this: ' The Jehovist (JE) sanctions a multiplicity of altars.' The main stress is here laid upon Exodus xx. 24-26, a passage contained in ' the main Jehovistic law, the so-called Book of the Covenant . . . a multiplicity of altars is not merely regarded as permissible, but assumed as a matter of course ' (p. 29); although their sites are not regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but ' as having been somehow or other selected by the Deity Himself, for His service. In perfect correspondence with the Jehovistic law is the Jehovistic narrative of the Pentateuch, as, in particular, the story of the patriarchs in J and E very clearly shows ' (p. 30).

Next, ' Deuteronomy (D) demands local unity of worship.' Here the emphasis is on Deuteronomy xii. 13-14; sacrifice is

not to be offered everywhere, but only ' in the place which the Lord shall choose.'

The Law is never weary of again and again repeating its injunction of local unity of worship. In doing so, it is in conscious opposition to ' the things that we do here this day,' and throughout has a polemical and reforming attitude towards existing usage. It is rightly, therefore, assigned by historical criticism to the period of the attacks made on the Bamoth by the reforming party at Jerusalem. . . . Deuteronomy is the legal expression of the second period of struggle and transition. . . . . From this the step is easy to the belief that the work whose discovery gave occasion to King Josiah to destroy the local sanctuaries was this very Book of Deuteronomy, which originally must have had an independent existence, and a shorter form than at present (p. 33).

Finally, ' the Priestly Code '—RQ Wellhausen calls it, but nowadays it is designated as P—' presupposes that unity, and transfers it, by means of the tabernacle, to primitive times.'

The tabernacle is not narrative merely, but, like all the narratives in that book [apparently Wellhausen means in P] law as well; it expresses the legal unity of the worship as an historical fact, which, from the very beginning, ever since the exodus, has held good in Israel. One God, one sanctuary, that is the idea. . . . Until the building of Solomon's temple the unity of worship according to it [Deuteronomy] had, properly speaking, never had any existence . . . the Priestly Code, on the other hand, is unable to think of religion without the one sanctuary, and cannot for a moment imagine Israel without it, carrying its actual existence back to the very beginning of the theocracy, and, in accordance with this, completely altering the ancient history. . . . The tabernacle is the copy, not the prototype of the temple at Jerusalem (pp. 34-37).

Now, therefore, we have the three stages in the legislation, corresponding to the three stages of historical development, and accordingly to be dated by them. The argument is now complete; and yet Wellhausen, with a strategic instinct for the vulnerable point, adds yet a third part to his first chapter, following upon the first and second parts, which latter profess to deal, as explained above, with the stages of history and legislation respectively. This third part is subdivided into two sections. The first section, which closely concerns us, bears the following heading: ' The tabernacle, as a central sanctuary and dwelling for the ark, can nowhere be found in the historical tradition.' The second section, entitled ' Nöldeke's view untenable,' need not occupy our attention. This third part opens rather jauntily: ' It may seem as if hitherto it had only been *asserted* that the tabernacle rests on an historical fiction. In truth it is proved; but

yet it may be well to add some things which have indeed been said long before now, but never as yet properly laid to heart ' (p. 39). To speak frankly, these things that are now at length to be laid to heart do not appear to us to be at all on the same level with the more or less powerful reasoning of the first two parts of the chapter; to some extent they consist of mere quibbling and shuffling, and of the excision of inconvenient passages. The attempt to find an inconsistency between 3 Kings iii. 1-4 and 2 Paralipomenon i. 3-6, does not greatly move us. It follows upon a classifying of Gibeon, Nob, and Shiloh as the ' permanent sites ' of the tabernacle, ' apart from which it was temporarily set up now here, now there, saving by its rapidity of movement—one might almost say ubiquity—the unity of the cultus. . . The dogmatic character of this way of making history, and the absurd consequences to which it leads, need not in the meantime be insisted on ' (p. 40). Truly, were Wellhausen less than a Teuton, we should suspect him of keeping his tongue in his cheek when complaining of dogmatic ways of making history.

It will be convenient to deal with this question of the tabernacle before considering the supposed legislative stages of the Pentateuch. In the first place, we must contend that the centre of the Jewish cult was not the tabernacle, but the ark of the Covenant. It is indeed strange that anyone who has read the descriptions of Exodus xxv.-xxx., xxxvii.-xxxiii., etc., should ever have thought anything else. It is true that the tabernacle is to be the tabernacle or dwelling of God; but His proper seat therein was between the cherubim belonging to the ark.[1] In concentrating his attention upon the tabernacle Wellhausen entirely misses the standpoint of the sacred writer.

Is the ark [he asks] a guarantee of the existence of the tabernacle? On the contrary, its whole history down to the period of its being deposited in the temple of Solomon is a proof that it was regarded as quite independent of any tent specially consecrated for its reception. But this abolishes the notion of the Mosaic tabernacle; for, according to the law, the two things belong necessarily to each other; the one cannot exist without the other; both are of equally great importance. The tabernacle must everywhere accompany the symbol of its presence; the darkness of the holy of holies is at the same time the life-element of the ark; only under compulsion of necessity, and even then not except under the cover of curtains, does it leave its lodging during a march, only to return to it again as soon as the new halting-place is reached (pp. 41-42).

[1] Note especially Exodus xxv, 22.

It is clear that we have here exaggerations, which cannot be justified by reference to chapter and verse; at the outset the ark is deliberately made portable (cf. especially Numbers iv.), and portable it remains, and when being carried it is, of course, no longer under the shelter of the tabernacle. Indeed, Mr. Wiener,[1] from the fact that 'the writer (of P) conceives the Levites primarily as a body of sacred porters' argues forcibly that 'the hypothesis that in P we have a projection of later conditions into the desert period breaks down under the weight of P's data.' Even when King David has to leave Jerusalem in flight from Absalom, it is assumed that the ark must follow (2 Kings xv. 24-25); it was not a new idea that it should be with the headquarters of the army. It is true that it was doubtless the loss of the ark and the sacking of Shiloh (cf. Josue xviii. 1; 1 Kings i.-iv.; Jeremias vii. 12-14) that led to a permanent separation of ark and tabernacle; but it is also perfectly clear that thereafter the interest of the sacred writer lies in the history of the ark rather than of the tabernacle. The former was at Kiriath-jearim twenty years (1 Kings vii. 1-2), perhaps until Saul was king, when it was liable to accompany him (xiv. 18-19).[2] It was David who brought it to Jerusalem, although, as we have seen, it was not considered to be permanently lodged until the building of the Temple. We may notice in passing that there was no ark in the second temple,[3] but everything still centred round the place where it should have been (cf. Apocalypse xi. 19). It had changed tent and tabernacle, the former, of course, the regular protection of the latter (1 Paralipomenon xvii. 5; cf. Exodus xxvi. 7, xxxvi. 14); nevertheless, it is the ark, rather than the tabernacle, which is spoken of as having been the dwelling-place of God (ibid., cf. 2 Kings vii. 6), as Wellhausen practically admits (p. 45). Truly we have here much ado about very little; the ark, as has been pointed out, remains the place of God's presence and the centre of worship. A calamity separates it from the tabernacle; but that only serves to bring out its essential character all the more. Wellhausen's pother about the tabernacle is irrelevant.

---

[1] *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 74-75.

[2] Some, however, prefer to follow the Septuagint and omit the reference to the ark here, considering that it was in the house of Abinadab at Kiriath-jearim during the whole of the period covered by 1 Kings vii. 1—2 Kings vi. 3. There seems to be no fatal objection to this view. 1 Kings xiv is again referred to at the end of this essay.

[3] Josephus, *Jewish War*, v, 5, 5.

We have, then, a centre for the worship—an important fact, when it is the question of centralization with which we have to deal. And now, what of the worship itself? More especially, what of the sacrifices? Although we have been compelled to insist that the ark was the true centre of the worship, because of the later separation from the tabernacle, still, in dealing with the earlier period we need not trouble to distinguish the two. That the official and national sacrifices were to be offered before the ark goes without saying; it is enough to point to Exodus xxix. or Leviticus i.-vii. But what of other sacrifices? The discrepancy that Wellhausen finds between the Yahwistic and Deuteronomic law really amounts to a supposed discrepancy between two important passages, viz., Exodus xx. 24-26 and Deuteronomy xii. 13-14. Can these two passages be reconciled? Really, the difficulty in so doing does not appear to be very great. Deuteronomy lays it down that burnt-offerings are not to be offered 'in any place that thou shalt see; but in the place which Yahweh shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.' This obviously refers to a future time, to Jerusalem and the Temple; and this is a fact which, as Wellhausen himself points out, but perhaps without seeing its full significance, is fully recognized even in the third book of Kings.[1] But the passage in Exodus deals, not with a distant future, but with the immediate present. 'An altar of earth thou shalt make Me, and thou shalt sacrifice thereupon thy burnt-offerings . . . in every place where I cause My name to be remembered I shall come to thee and bless thee.' We certainly seem to have a permission to build many altars, not promiscuously, but where there had been some kind of divine manifestation or intervention, such as in the case of Gideon (Judges vi.). This permission, we may infer from 3 Kings iii. 2, already referred to, as from Deuteronomy itself, was provisional, till the building of the Temple. It must be remembered that previous to their entry into Palestine the Israelites possessed a highly centralized form of government and religion; but after their entry there was a certain decentralization and disintegration, very noticeable in the book of Judges. The kingship and the building of the Temple tended to restore and enforce unity in religion and government; but the division of the kingdom prevented the

[1] Cf. p. 48.

full attainment of either. Wellhausen is fairly correct in saying that it was only after the exile that they were complete. None the less up to that time the ark had been the *de jure* centre of divine worship; afterwards, as we have seen, it might be called such *exigetive*, as the scholastics would say.

If we were now to consider every passage that had been or might conceivably be urged against the general thesis outlined above, we should make no end. For the most part a careful study of the position indicated and of individual passages will result, it is hoped, in the latter confirming rather than weakening the former. It may be enough, therefore, to comment very briefly on three or four incidents. That of Judges xvii.-xviii. was evidently largely unlawful; and the mere words of the priest in Judges xviii. 6 are no proof to the contrary. In Judges xxi. 4, 1 Kings xiv. we may reasonably suppose that the ark is with Israel in its battles (cf. Judges xx. 26-28, xxi. 2; 1 Kings xiv. 18); in the latter chapter the precise sin of the people is clearly indicated in the 33rd verse. As a matter of fact, in neither case is the Temple yet built, so that other solutions would be possible. Again, the divine interposition in favour of David may well have been the first cause for Samuel's sacrifice at Bethlehem (1 Kings xvi. 1-5), and the family may have continued to celebrate the event (1 Kings xx. 6, 28-29). Finally, in 3 Kings xviii., we have a trial of strength rather than a sacrifice; the true God is to 'answer by fire' (xviii. 24).

WELLHAUSEN AND THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD.

THE Church has had countless heretics to combat her doctrine in past ages, but none perhaps so insidious as the present-day rationalists, who have conceived their campaign on a scale as thorough as we should expect from the country of its origin. Their plan is nothing less than to ridicule the historical character of Holy Writ. All the so-called relations, they say, between God and man are easily explained on natural grounds: they evolved. That the supernatural existed was a fairy-tale, good enough to satisfy our crinolined great-grandmothers; but we!—well, we have grown out of all that. And they adopt a patronizing air towards the Sacred Writings. Yes, they say, the stories have a sub-stratum of natural truth—but that the Holy Ghost had any part in their production, that God had any dealings with His people—of course we should like to be sure first that there is a God at all. This attitude is a difficult one to meet. The martyr could oppose the tyrant with patience, and triumph; the open-voiced heretic could be met with plain denial, and proof of his error. But your modern 'critic' is nothing if not specious; for he can produce the fruits of painstaking research, and trick them out with a pinch of truth, a modicum of conjecture, and a great deal of unjustified and unavowed cynicism, and there lies before the unwary a very tempting dish, but one, alas! that can poison the very life of faith.

The theory with which we are here concerned is that most ably represented in modern time by Professor Wellhausen, whose world-wide influence in Old Testament criticism is too generally recognised to need emphasizing. The precise point in his teaching which we here propose to scrutinize is this: according to him the office of the Levites of later times had

no authority from the statutes of Moses. Before coming to details, a word as to its place in the general strategy of the rationalist offensive will not be out of place. Baldly stated, their position is this. The Sacred Scriptures have no divine origin. Here we are obviously concerned with the Old Testament. The Divine origin of the Old Testament depends on the Pentateuch; but the Pentateuch is not good history, in fact, it is not the work of Moses. If this minor premise can be proved, Professor Wellhausen's conclusion is thus far justified: therefore the Old Testament has no Divine origin.

It is in the main to the proof of this minor premise that the Professor's work on the History of Israel is devoted. One important chapter deals with the question of the Priests and Levites of Israel. We shall follow him, then, as he builds up his story; and afterwards examine it more in detail. He practically assumes that the Pentateuch has been proved to come from four different sources. This, the well-known Documentary hypothesis, we may briefly describe as follows. This theory denies the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses, but assigns it to four chief sources. The authors of these four documents were not contemporaneous, but the result of their labours is comprised in the complete Pentateuch. The critics claim to be able to recognise the various sources: hence, somewhat gratuitously, they break up the work, assigning now a large portion to one source, now to another. So painstaking are they that occasionally they also assign even a word or two in the middle of a verse to a source different to that of the rest of the verse. The result of their labours may be seen in the 'Rainbow Bible,' where the different sources are printed in different colours.

A rough division of the sources will not be out of place. The first and second sources—for our purpose the first two may be considered together—date from about the eighth or ninth century, after the division of the Kingdom. These sources the critics label with the letters J and E, corresponding to the use of the names Jahveh (Yahweh) or Elohim for God.

In the time of King Josiah, a little before the year B.C. 621, another writer added his quota to the Pentateuch. This source is ticketed D, for it consists mainly of the Book of Deuteronomy. This part—so say the critics—was written, hidden, and suddenly very conveniently found, as coming from the 'worm-eaten holes of long vanished days,' all in collusion with the prophet Jeremiah. The credulity of the

pious Josiah was imposed upon: and the family of Zadok by this clever ruse secured their aim, that Jerusalem, their own shrine, should be the only place of worship.

But still another source was necessary: this was the Priestly Code, P. The hand of the author of this document is recognizable in many places of the Pentateuch: but his chief contribution is the Book of Leviticus in its entirety. This document reads everything back to Moses. Eventually the documents are combined, re-edited as a single work; and behold, the Pentateuch, claiming indeed to be the work of the great Lawgiver, but in reality the outcome of the political intrigue of a selfish and crafty priesthood.

In the light of this brief summary of the Documentary hypothesis it is easy to understand that the man who can prove it correct has gone far to upset the claim of the Old Testament to divine origin. As will be seen, it depends in part upon a peculiar and, as we should say, a rather violent interpretation of certain parts of the Old Testament outside the Pentateuch itself. But the main question is, how does it square with the history of the Hebrews as a whole? It was in his efforts to answer this question that Wellhausen made his mark. Taking the Documentary hypothesis in the main for granted, he has undertaken to interpret the 'historical books'—Judges, Kings, and the historical hints of the prophets—in the light of it, and he maintains that the results positively confirm the hypothesis.

Wellhausen begins with two assumptions: the first, that before the authors of the document J, E wrote, the Israelites, as they occupied the land of Chanaan, had taken up the high places of native worship for their own cult of Yahweh; the second, that the original tribe of Levi had disappeared. Now, he continues, you will notice that in the period represented by J, E, there was no such thing as a monopoly of the priesthood vested in the family of Levi. Of course, there were priests in the High Places, but they were members of the tribe on the spot, whichever that tribe might be. Thus it is that we read in the sixth chapter of Judges that Gideon offered a burnt-offering with the wood of an Asherah in the High Places lately sacred to Baal: and also in 1 Kings, that King Saul built an altar unto the Lord.

We come now to the second stage in the evolution of the Levite. The family of Eli had been rejected; and the family of Zadok elevated to the High Priesthood; this is a matter of history—we still follow the Professor's lead—to be read

by anyone who will take the trouble to look at the second chapter of 1 Kings. Further, what is more natural than that the house of Zadok should scheme to have all influence in its own hands? How better to achieve this than to centralize all worship at Jerusalem? The strategy is plain. The tactics are to play on the credulity of the pious King Josiah. The prophet Jeremiah is pressed to their aid. The dramatic finding of the so-called Mosaic work Deuteronomy is a *fait accompli*. His Majesty is imposed upon; all High Places, save one, are broken up by the royal ukase; the family of Zadok is secure in their position at Jerusalem. This, says Wellhausen, is true history, and agrees with the Pentateuch; for centralization of worship is the burden of the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy, the thirteenth verse explicitly commanding, 'Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest; but in the place that the Lord shall choose.'

But the line of Zadok soon found that King Josiah (2 Kings xxiii.) had acted on a poorly planned regulation in their forged document (Deuteronomy xviii. 7). True, he had closed all the High Places save their own, and so, as the Zadok line had wished, Jerusalem had no rival. But, unfortunately for the family, Josiah had invited the priests, whose occupation was now gone, to Jerusalem, and there had given them equal rights with the line of Zadok. All these priests, it is assumed, including those at Jerusalem, from being a caste had long come to claim to be a tribe—the lost tribe of Levi; up to this time, therefore, 'priest' and 'Levite' were synonymous, though the critics deny that any priests were really of Levitical descent. But owing to these common rights at Jerusalem the success of the Zadok line was tinged with failure. That failure must be set right. After the exile, said they, a fresh start may be made. The prophet Jeremiah had served their purpose very well before. Ezechiel is to be their tool on this occasion. He readily falls in with the suggestion, and preaches openly (chap. xliv.): 'The priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me.' And what of those that went astray? A little earlier he had considered their case. 'The Levites that went far from me . . . they shall bear their iniquity. Yet they shall be ministers in my sanctuary, having oversight at the gates of the house . . . and they shall not come near unto me to execute

the office of priest unto me.' In other words, says Wellhausen, although hitherto priest and Levite were considered identical, now, however, Ezechiel has invented the distinct and inferior office of Levite to solve the problem created by D. And so the line of Zadok has scored an advantage once more, and has very successfully covered up their little mistake in Deuteronomy.

There only remains for this enterprising family to clinch the whole matter. Once more the Pentateuch is overhauled, the document P—the Priestly Code—is inserted, bodily in parts (to wit, the whole book of Leviticus), piecemeal in other parts; and behold all the fruits of their scheming have the sanction of the Lawgiver. In other words, the Priestly Code, presupposing what Ezechiel had done, namely, to distinguish the priests from the Levites, reads the whole thing back to Moses and states boldly what is really a lie; that this distinction is the law of Moses.

This is Wellhausen's theory; at the risk of being tedious, let us state it once more very shortly. It is this : the Levitical office at Jerusalem had no origin from Moses; for all trace of the original tribe of Levi had gone. Further, at the outset of the Hebrews' religious history we find that anyone, cleric or lay, could offer sacrifice to God. Unity of worship was the policy of King Josiah, carried out in 621 B.C. at the instigation of the house of Zadok, which had superseded the house of Eli. The Levitical office was the creation of Ezechiel, in order to enable the family of Zadok to reject the claims of priests of the other High Places to share rights with them at Jerusalem, and so to degrade them to a lower office. This creation the family of Zadok skilfully stamped with Mosaic sanction by embodying in the Pentateuch the Priestly Code; and thus the Levitical office is the outcome of chicanery, and by no means bears the impress of Divine institution.

This is the elaborate story that the Professor puts forward as history. It has proved attractive enough to enlist a vast number of scholars and an immense literature in its support; yet its claim to historical truth is rather thin to oust the tradition, of so venerable an age, that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses. Further, if this is to supersede the traditional account, it must be a little less open to criticism itself. The honest critic takes evidence as he finds it. If the facts do not fit the theory, it is the theory that must suffer. Mr. Sherlock Holmes wove beautiful theories; and they were always right; but then he had his faithful henchman, Dr. Watson, to write

the evidence to fit; and this we call fiction. Professor Wellhausen, in somewhat the same way, plays Watson to his own Holmes, and calls it history. For instance, the evidence of Exodus xix. 22, where Moses mentions priests, is not to his liking: but he applies the national remedy, and that 'scrap of paper' is torn from the book. In Exodus xxxii. 29, the sons of Levi are chosen as the instrument of God's vengeance. It is a pity, of course, but necessity, you know! And so that place, too, finds its rest in the waste-paper basket. Chapters vii.-x. of Exodus give prominence to Aaron; those verses, too, must be given to the flames. These are few of many instances. May we not say at the outset of the criticism of the critic, that, if not pure fiction, this theory of his has at least a flavour of the novelist's arbitrary disposition of facts and persons?

Again, we may ask: Whither has the original tribe of Levi so conveniently vanished? And where did the new clan get their name from? Here the professor is puzzled, and admits it. 'It suits me to have them out of the way,' he airily observes, 'therefore they must have vanished. As for the name, that is easy to explain. Coincidence!' His statement, of course, is not so openly brutal, but shorn of all ornament it comes to that.

These are the two initial difficulties of a general character against his scheme. Let us now take his stages in order, and see if they hang together.

In the first stage, then, Wellhausen appeals to Gideon and Saul to prove that there was no distinction between priests and lay-folk. But if he would consult Exodus xx. 24, he would find due provision made for such sacrifices on special occasions. Again, he ignores the centralization of cult through the ark—a fact that can be well established. Moreover, from 1 Kings xiv. 18, in a chapter on which he relies, it is clear that the ark and its priests were there.

Wellhausen's second stage supposes that the rejected house of Eli was superseded by Zadok. Now this Zadok, he states, was not of the line of Levi, much less of the house of Aaron. The text on which Wellhausen relies, we must admit, presents a difficulty. It will be well, then, to quote it more fully and examine it. The passage is 1 Kings ii. 27-35:

> And there came a man of God unto Eli and said unto him: Thus saith the Lord: Did I reveal myself unto the house of thy fathers, when they were in Egypt in bondage in Pharaoh's house? And did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest? . . . Wherefore kick ye at

mine offering . . . and honourest thy sons above me? . . . Therefore the Lord God of Israel saith: I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever, but now the Lord saith: Be it far from me. . . . Behold the days come that I will cut off thine arm and the arm of thy father's house, that there shall not be an old man in thine house. . . . And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind.

Hence argues the Professor: Eli's house is rejected; his father's house is rejected; and the house, mark, that was chosen in Egypt, that is to say, Aaron's house. Hence with Eli was rejected the house of Aaron: from this follows that Zadok, his successor, is not of the house of Aaron. This argument seems sound: and if this was the only passage on the point, the conclusion would merit the note, 'most probable.' But follow it out. Wellhausen and the critics ascribe this passage to the Deuteronomist source, precisely because it legitimizes Zadok. Yet it denies him Levitical descent! D and P, to say nothing of Ezechiel, continually emphasize the Levitical descent. Have we here a blatant contradiction? Further, 1 Paral. vi. and xxiv. trace Zadok through Eleazar to Aaron and hence to Levi; and he is represented as being already a priest, both when he is put into Abiathar's place (3 Kings ii. 27, 35), and before that (e.g., 2 Kings xvii. 15). We have followed the Professor in all fairness of mind and he has led us into a *cul de sac*. Not being able to adopt his attitude towards these chapters of 1 Paral., and ruthlessly tear them out, we must try another way out. Cannot the mention of the 'Father's house' mean that the house of Aaron, as *officially represented* by the junior branch of Eli, is to give place to what was as a matter of fact the senior branch, of which Zadok was the scion? We claim no certainty for the suggestion offered; it has, however, the merit of not being a blind alley.

Furthermore, as a link in his story, Wellhausen has supposed that Deuteronomy xviii. 7 made provision for the priests of the High Places when they were broken up. This is not consistent with the thirteenth chapter of the same book, where the penalty for turning aside to the false gods of the country is death. The idolatry at the High Places Wellhausen finds it convenient to ignore: it is evident, however, that the worship conducted there was in the main addressed to the Canaanite Baalim, the original possessors of the shrines. For proof of this it may suffice here to instance the very clear passages in the Book of Judges (e.g., ii. 11-13;

iii. 6, 7; viii. 33; x. 6). Doubtless Yahweh was sometimes worshipped there, though, speaking generally, contrary to His wish. The High Places at Ramah and Bethlehem (1 Kings ix. 12-13, 19, 25; xx. 6, 28-29). appear to have been originally a shrine of the kind especially authorized by Exodus xx. 24-25. On the other hand, it is announced as a change in 2 Paral. xxxiii. 17, that the worship in the High Places in general was offered up to Yahweh alone. Hezekiah evidently stopped both the idolatry and the illicit worship of the true God in the High Places (3 Kings xviii. 22; xxi. 3; 2 Paral. xxxii. 12; xxxiii. 3; Isaiah xxxvi. 7). Possibly, indeed, with the building of the Temple at Jerusalem absolutely all sacrificing elsewhere was intended to stop; we might understand this from such a passage as Deuteronomy xii. 5, 6. In any case, if we look to the account of King Josiah's proceedings in 4 Kings xxiii (cf. xxiv. 17), there, too, obviously, we have to do with priests engaged in idolatry. It is also evident that these false priests were not provided for. They were not all executed; perhaps they were too many: 'nevertheless the priests of the High Places came not up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren.'

There remains to discuss the part played by Ezechiel. According to Wellhausen the prophet was the ready tool of the house of Zadok. He it was who invented the Levitical office and degraded to it the priests of the High Places, to cover up that family's unfortunate slip in the D document. The truth, however, is that the picture which the prophet draws in his final chapters of a restored Israel is in more than one detail—we may instance the very artificial division of the land, and the waters that flow from the sanctuary—impracticable, and even impossible, and appears rather to have a symbolic value. No attempt was made to realize it. In any case his words do not require the invention of a new office.

The verses in question are in Ezech. xliv. 10-15; xlviii. 11. The most important words are cited above on pages 61-62. Two explanations are possible. We might suppose—and on the whole this seems the more likely alternative—that there was no degradation strictly so-called of any priests. In that case these Levites, who had usurped the sacerdotal functions in a false religion, were relegated to the duties that were theirs; in common parlance, were told to attend to their own business. This naturally involved some shame. As a parallel we might wonder what superiors would say to a

sacristan who should take upon himself one Sunday morning to conduct a service in the High Place at Tremeirchion. No doubt he would receive a severe admonition, but a request to confine himself to his duties at St. Beuno's would hardly be considered a degradation. There is no real hint in the prophet that he is inventing either a new office or a new distinction among ministers. The contrast between 'the priests the Levites' (i.e., the Levitical priests, as distinguished from the false non-Levitical priests) and the Levites is simply presupposed, and not introduced for the first time.[1] But grant, as an alternative, that it was a real degradation of priests, it is still natural to argue that the Levitical office was already in existence, and was not the invention of Ezechiel. Needless to say, there is ample evidence that it existed, but on one plea or another, the evidence is rejected. The Levite of Judges xvii. 7 is reasonably interpreted to have had his home in Judah; the 'critics' wish to make him out a member of the tribe, but this is in direct contradiction to Judges xviii. 30, where 'Moses' is generally recognized to be the right reading. The Levites also appear carrying the ark in 1 Kings vi. 15; 2 Kings xv. 24—just where we should expect to find them.

But to return to Ezechiel. If Wellhausen is right in supposing that the family of Zadok in the Priestly Code falsely read these injunctions back to Moses, the subject Levites might easily quote against them the document D, and Ezechiel himself, for both these latter, according to the Professor, clearly show that in earlier days Levites and priests were on the same footing; and so the Levites would have a good case. Can we imagine that this numerous body of men would have taken this set-back with the meekness that Wellhausen must suppose, if his hypothesis was to have in practice the happy result that he pictures?

Thus, at the end, we are led to ask: Can it be pretended that the position taken up by Wellhausen and his school is merely the result of an impartial study of the evidence? The more minutely the proof of this specious theory is investigated, the greater the violence which it will be found to do to inconvenient data, and unconsciously we find ourselves murmuring that in very truth the higher critic is 'hacking his way through' the Sacred Scriptures.

[1] Note especially Ezech. xliv, 10, 15; xlviii, 11.

Note.—It may be observed that even before he was put into Abiathar's place as high priest (iii Kings ii, 27, 35), Zadok is not merely himself called a priest, but is practically treated as Abiathar's equal (ii Kings viii, 17; xv, 24-35; xvii, 15; xix, 11; xx, 25; 3 Kings i, 26, 39). No doubt he owed his prominence in some measure to the fact that he was the head of the other branch of the house of Aaron (i Parah, xxiv, 3), and probably had attracted David's favourable notice while still a young man (i Parah. xxi, 28); but it also seems likely that the separation of the ark from the tabernacle, due to the capture of the former by the Philistines (i Kings iv, 11), greatly increased the importance of his position. It gave him an independent ministry before the tabernacle at Gibeon (1 Parah. xvi, 39), although the ark, upon which dwelt Yahweh between the cherubim (Exod. xxv, 22; Cf. Psalm lxxix (lxxx), 2, etc.), remained David's chief care (1 Parah. xvii; 2 Kings vii).

It may also be observed that even if one were to allow that the Zadok line was non-Aaronic, and that it was absolutely substituted for an Aaronic line, this would not of itself go very far towards establishing Wellhausen's position. Genesis xlix, 5-7, for him must mean absolute disappearance, not a 'scattering' turned afterwards for Levi into a blessing; Deut. xxxiii, 8-11, in contradiction to the obvious enumbration of Levi as a tribe, must signify a corporation of men sundered from kith and kin—an obscure passage at the best, apparently referring to incidents unrecorded in Exod. xvii, and Numb. xx, though we should more naturally think of Exod. xxxii, 28-29. In actual fact there can be no question of all these supposed levites having been put on equal terms with the Jerusalem priests; the priests of the northern high places, King Josiah slew (4 Kings xxiii, 20), while the priests of the southern high places, though spared, seem to have been dealt with in the manner prescribed for Aaronic priests with a blemish (4 Kings xxiii, 9; Levit. xxi, 16-24).

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THE question of the antiquity of man, which is dealt with in another essay, does not introduce us to anything like strict chronology; but it is of evident importance in order to the better understanding of the biblical narrative that we should establish points of contact with contemporary history and an established system of dates. In the present essay, accordingly, an attempt is made to fit the earlier parts of Old Testament history into what we know of the early history of some other nations. Our *terminus a quo*, from which we shall work back, will be the building of the Temple, which it seems possible to date with some degree of accuracy; the *terminus ad quem* will be the incidents of Genesis xiv. where an independent synchronism will serve to confirm the results already obtained. Some of the chief difficulties will then be considered. It may be as well to say at once that it does not seem possible to arrive at absolute certainty; if the general trend of the argument point to one definite conclusion, at least no attempt will be made to minimise what may tell against it.

Both the Assyrian and the Egyptian monuments furnish a clue to the date of the beginning of the Temple. The former show *Ahabbu mat Sir'ilaa* fighting with his allies against Shalmaneser II, King of Assyria, at the battle of Karkar (Quarqara). In spite of some difficulties, it may be taken as generally admitted that this is 'Ahab of the land of Israel,' and the date is given as 853 or 854 B.C. For a discussion of the question it may be enough to refer to Dr. Pinches' important work, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chapter x.). We can now proceed to fix the beginning of the Temple within

certain fairly large limits, premising that throughout this essay we shall only attempt approximations, inasmuch as the nature of the evidence forbids us to hope for more. It may be remembered that the Books of Kings furnish us, not merely with a chronological scheme of the reigns of the Kings of Judah and Israel, but also with a system of cross-references between the two that creates no little difficulty. Father Deimel, indeed, the Professor of Assyriology at the Biblical Institute, in his *Veteris Testamenti Chronologia* (p. 118) quotes with approval St. Jerome's saying: 'ut huiusmodi haerere quaestionibus non tam studiosi quam otiosi hominis esse videatur.' Without stopping to discuss details, therefore, we may conclude from this datum to about 974-948 B.C. as the outside limits for the beginning of the Temple. The reader may consult the convenient table on pp. 104-105 of the *Chronologia*.

The Egyptian evidence turns upon the invasion of Judah by the Pharaoh Sheshenq in the fifth year of Rehoboam (3 Kings xiv. 25). Prof. Flinders Petrie, in his *History of Egypt* (vol. iii. pp. 234-235), has no difficulty in identifying this invasion with that monarch's Syrian campaign. Putting the narratives of Kings and Paralipomena together, he says: 'This accords perfectly with the contemporary record in Egypt. And when an encyclopaedic critic states that "it is difficult to doubt that Shishak and Shushakim are corruptions of Cushi and Cushim," and "they belong to well-ascertained types of textual corruption," it is evident that this form of historical criticism belongs to a well-ascertained type of critical aberration.' Prof. Flinders Petrie would himself put the invasion in 933 B.C., which would give 977-937 B.C. for Solomon—though the frequency with which periods of forty years recur may possibly indicate the use of round numbers—and 973 B.C. for the beginning of the Temple (3 Kings vi. 1; xi. 42). This only just falls within the limits fixed by the Assyrian data, but, as has already been said, we cannot hope for more than approximate dates.

In 3 Kings vi. 1 we are further told that it was in the 480th year after the Exodus that Solomon began the Temple. Adding this 480 to the 973 above, we get 1453 B.C. as roughly the date of the Exodus. The various chronological items making up this period may be found tabulated in Father Deimel's *Chronologia* (p. 97). In the Hebrew text they total to 534 years (588 in the Septuagint), with an uncertain addi-

tion to be made for the government of Josue, Samgar (possibly), Samuel and Saul. In order to reconcile this high figure with the 480 given above, it has been suggested that the 114 years in all spent under foreign domination are not to be counted separately, but as already comprised under the years assigned to the judges. This view is by no means free from difficulty; yet it leaves us with the very plausible equation 420+Josue, (Samgar), Samuel, and Saul=480, and it therefore appears wisest to adopt it as a working hypothesis.

We now proceed to work back from the Exodus to the incident of Genesis xiv., when we find the system we have adopted confirmed by a striking synchronism. Taking the 430 years of Exodus xii. 40 with the Massoretic text (i.e., the traditional rabbinical text), and the great mass of authorities to refer to the sojourning in Egypt only, we must add a little under 215 years to the 1453 years already obtained to arrive, as desired, at Genesis xiv. The 215 years are obtained as follows: Abraham migrated into Canaan at 75 (Genesis xii. 4), and Isaac was born to him when 100 (Genesis xxi. 5), and Jacob descends into Egypt 190 years later (Genesis xxv. 26; xlvii. 9): hence the total sojourn in Canaan is 100—75+190=215 years. We take a little *under* 215 years, because the incident of Genesis xiv. takes place a little after the arrival into Canaan recorded in Genesis xii.; if we call it 210 years, then these 210 years+the 430 years in Egypt of Exodus xii. 40+1453 B.C. as the date of the Exodus give 2093 B.C. as the date of Genesis xiv. And this result confirms the rest of the scheme, inasmuch as the date thus reached falls within the period during which Hammurabi, King of Babylon, was probably reigning. According to many, Hammurabi is the Amraphel of Genesis xiv. 1; this identification, and that of Amraphel's allies, is worked out at length by Dr. Pinches [1]; and Dr. Sayce has lately declared [2] that 'only a German with German ideas of historical evidence would dispute Dr. Pinches' discovery of the names of Chedorlaomer and his allies in Babylonian literature. . . They have been reproduced by the Biblical writer with singular exactitude.' Dr. King, too, in his *History of Babylon* (pp. 159-160), remarks that 'though we have as yet found no trace

[1] *The Old Testament in the light of the historical records of Assyria and Babylonia*, ed. 2, pp. 208-233.

[2] *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. xl. p. 92, May, 1918.

in secular sources of such a confederation under the leadership of Elam, the Hebrew record represents a state of affairs in Western Asia which was not impossible during the earlier half of Hammurabi's reign.' Dr. King gives 2123-2081 B.C. for Hammurabi's reign, and Father Deimel, in his *Chronologia*, gives 2132-2089 B.C.; it will be observed that on these reckonings 2093 B.C. falls into the later half of Hammurabi's reign, but, as has been said, all these dates are merely approximate, and the substantial agreement in the date unquestionably lends strength to the whole scheme here outlined.

Another possible interpretation of Exodus xii. 40, however, should here be noted. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint insert Canaan in this verse alongside of Egypt, making the 430 years cover the sojourn in both, and we should naturally suppose that St. Paul, in Galatians iii. 17, was following the Septuagint computation. The total stay in Canaan, as has been explained above, amounts to 215 years, so that with this reading only the other 215 years would be left for the stay in Egypt. And the case for this shorter period in Egypt, it might well be claimed, is much strengthened by the statement in Genesis xv. 16, that it is the fourth generation that is to come out of Egypt, a statement itself borne out by the actual enumeration of generations. We get Levi Caath Amram Moses (Exodus vi. 16-20); Levi Caath Isaar Core (Exodus vi. 16-21; Numbers xvi. 1); Levi Caath Oziel Mizael (Exodus vi. 16-22; Leviticus x. 4); Ruben Phallu Eliab Dathan (Numbers xxvi. 5-9); and, moreover, Josue's generation appears to be reckoned as the fifth (e.g., Josue vii. 1; cf. Genesis xxxviii. 30). But against these considerations, and against the tempting hypothesis of a shorter stay in Egypt, stands the very serious and even decisive objection, that we should have to abandon the identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi. It appears wisest to accept this objection as fatal, because of the great difficulty of placing the incident of Genesis xiv. with anything like probability any later in history. On the supposition of the longer Egyptian stay, a ' generation ' in Genesis xv. 16 may be taken with Father Hetzenauer [1] to be capable of meaning a century or more like the Latin *saeculum*; whether, however, in the light of what has been said, that be the more natural meaning, is another question. We have

[1] *Comment, in Librum Genesis.* ad loc.

here a reproduction on a smaller scale of the difficulties arising out of the ages assigned to the patriarchs, already touched upon in connection with the 'The Antiquity of Man,' and hardly worth re-opening here; whatever solution we adopt, the 430 years in Egypt are best respected. As for the interpretation of Galatians iii. 17, the best of several suggestions seems to be, that it should be taken to mean just what it says, and no more; the interval was at least that, and St. Paul was not concerned to discover, or at all events to say whether it was more. With the Greek version alone accessible to his readers, to have given the longer interval deduced from the Hebrew text might have been to lay himself open to a cavilling retort.

The above is a conservative scheme of chronology, in that it may be said to follow the most obvious indications of the sacred text, and to be that which Catholics in the main follow; nevertheless, it does not find much favour outside the Church, where the general tendency is to put the Exodus more than two hundred years later, on grounds little discussed hitherto by Catholics. *Mere* exegetical tradition, as is clear from the *Providentissimus Deus* itself, and as was pointed out in connexion with the Flood, must not be mistaken for strictly dogmatic tradition; the former may be at fault in such a manner as mere chronology, which does not directly involve faith or morals. It is necessary to review the chief objections to the above scheme, therefore, not as difficulties against a dogma which must at all costs be upheld, but with a view to ascertaining whether prudence and sound scholarship require that, while safeguarding biblical inerrancy, we should cast about for some other interpretation of the biblical figures, which would bring them better into line with modern discoveries. Not to keep the reader waiting for his answer, it may be said at once that to the present writer there does not seem to be any really sufficient call for a drastic change in the chronology here in question, that is to say, it still appears best to place the Exodus about the middle of the fifteenth century. There are some difficulties in the way to warn us against too round and intolerant an assertion of our own position; they impose caution, but not the complete abandonment of ancient landmarks.

In the first place there are the Egyptian campaigns in Syria. It is said that on the scheme of chronology already explained the Israelites should actually be in Palestine, and

that there is no mention of an encounter in either the Egyptian or Hebrew records. In general it may be answered that a good deal depends upon a right understanding of the period of the judges; it was a time of disintegration, and of slow and difficult penetration after the brilliant success of Josue. It was one thing to overrun the Promised Land, another to settle in it and take permanent possession of it. The Book of Josue shows us the land assigned to the tribes; the Book of Judges their partial failure to secure it.

To come to particulars. Two Egyptian invaders of Palestine have to be reckoned with, Rameses II and Rameses III. For the date of Rameses II, Prof. Flinders Petrie, in his *History of Egypt* (vol. iii., p. 28), gives 1300-1234 B.C.; Prof. Sayce, in his *Egypt of the Hebrews* (p. 316), gives 1348-1281 B.C. Rameses II undertook Syrian campaigns in his first, second, and fourth years, and it was the last of these that roused the Hittite confederacy in the north to more or less successful resistance. 'Notwithstanding the pompous boasts of Ramessu, the Egyptians had to remain content with Palestine, and did not possess more than had been easily acquired in the beginning of his reign.'[1] 'The result of the war was a drawn game.'[2] These remarks of Prof. Petrie's apply to Rameses' fourth year. It was in his twenty-first year that his celebrated treaty with the Hittites was ratified, and there seems no reason to doubt that Palestine was at this time in the Egyptian sphere.

> Of the latter part of the reign there are no records, except a few trivial papyri and ostraka. . . . Thus we have no details of the greater part of this reign, and can only say that there do not seem to have been any wars for over fifty years. While the credit of the earlier wars lasted, Egypt was probably untroubled; but as those who had fought died off, Egypt gradually weakened, and her enemies strengthened. The old age of a long reign is always perilous for a fighting state; and Ramessu, living to 85, could not have undertaken fighting for long before he died. Early in the next reign we find that the Libyans were not only pillaging but settling in the country, and it was thought much for the Egyptians to triumph over even the southern towns of Palestine. It seems, then, that a long period of gradual decline occupied the greater part of this much-boasted reign.[3]

Having thus reduced the argument on its Egyptian side to something like its true proportion, let us do the same for the Hebrew evidence. The Israelites are said to have spent

---

[1] Petrie, *History*, vol. iii. p. 47. [2] Ibid. p. 55.
[3] Ibid pp.71, 72.

forty years in the desert (e.g., Numbers xxxii. 13), so that the date 1453 B.C. for the Exodus would give us 1413 B.C. as the date when Josue assumed the leadership; how long he held it, we are not told. Othoniel and Aod take 120 years together;—if, on principles explained above, we take no notice of 26 years of foreign domination, but on the other hand allow 30 years for Josue, then by 1263 B.C. there have been but two judges in Israel, and we are told practically nothing of their rule. On Prof. Petrie's reckoning, Rameses II's reign is already more than half over, and on Prof. Sayce's reckoning, it has been quite over some years. If we consider the character of the later part of Rameses' reign, and also how little we are told of the two judges in question, the silence of the records does not seem so wonderful.

Still, as regards the Egyptian monuments of this time, we may ask, is their silence so complete? Under Rameses II's son and successor, Merenptah, we have a mention of Israel that seems to wreck the whole argument from silence. There is question of deliverance from a league of tribes, and among other boasts the Pharaoh declares that 'the people of Israel is laid waste—their crops are not, Kharu (Palestine) has become as a widow of Egypt.' Prof. Petrie remarks that 'the name of the people of Israel here is very surprising in every way; it is the only instance of the name Israel on any monument, and it is four centuries before any mention of the race in cuneiform; it is clearly outside of our literary information, which has led to the belief that there were no Israelites in Palestine between the going into Egypt and the entry at Jericho. . . The only likely conclusion is that there were others of the tribe left behind, or immediately returning, at the time of the famine.' It has seemed best to quote a good deal of the context, for fear of seeming to misrepresent the learned Egyptologist. It will be seen that, unable to surrender his conviction of a late Exodus, he still feels that, somehow or other, Israelites must be got into Palestine before it! The point is worth noting, because we shall recognize the same makeshift theory when we come to the Tel-el-Amarna correspondence.[1]

[1] *The Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* for 1916 (p. 42) gives a new interpretation of this inscription by Prof. Edward Naville, translating 'The Israelites are swept off, his seed are no more.' On this astonishing change in the rendering we have yet to hear the experts' final judgment.

As regards Rameses III, Prof. Sayce wrote strongly in 1895,[1] without himself volunteering a date for the monarch:

When Rameses III overran the southern portion of Palestine, and built the temple of the Theban god at the spot now known at Khurbet Kan'an, not far from Hebron, the Israelites could not as yet have entered the Promised Land. There is no reference to the Egyptians in the Pentateuch, and there is no reference to the Israelites in the hieroglyphic texts of Medinet Habu. Hebron, Migdal, Karmel of Judah, Ir-Shemesh and Hadashah, all alike fell into the hands of the Egyptian invaders, but neither in the Egyptian nor in the Hebrew records is there any allusion to a struggle between Egypt and Israel. When Joshua entered Canaan all these cities belonged to the Canaanites, and when Rameses III attacked them this was also the case. The Palestinian campaign of Rameses must have prepared the way for the Israelitish conquest; it could not have followed after it.

But ten years later Prof. Petrie, in his *History of Egypt* (vol. iii., pp. 152-3), puts the matter in a very different light.

Unfortunately there is no account of the Syrian war; and that a great land fight took place we only learn from the scenes of groups of Amorite captives, and the Philistines and Zakkaru escaping in ox wagons. Unhappily the lists of captive towns have been so largely copied from earlier conquests, that we cannot use them for history; especially as the walls of the Ramesseum, which were probably their prototype, have nearly all been destroyed, and cannot be compared.

We may thus reasonably decline to take this difficulty very seriously until the main facts are more clearly ascertained. We may also, of course, allege Merenptah's inscription once more, and further suggest that possibly the Philistines might be holding Jewish towns in South Palestine. Prof. Petrie gives 1202-1170 B.C. as the date of Rameses III; this date does not bring us anywhere near Samson, who seems to be the only judge of moment belonging to the southern group of tribes. We may presume Samgar to belong to this group, since he smites the Philistines (Judges iii. 31), but we are hardly told anything of him, and there is no other southern judge whatever. Even in Samson's time Judah is represented as under Philistine domination (Judges xv. 11). Here again, even in what concerns the Hebrews, and abstracting from the Egyptian monuments, the objection appears to be based on an insufficient realization of the general state of affairs in the time of the judges.

[1] *Egypt of the Hebrews*, pp 89-90.

Nevertheless the Philistines are a whole difficulty in themselves; but a difficulty of such large proportions as not to bear with particular weight against any one system of chronology. 'The Philistine settlement in Canaan,' writes Prof. Sayce,[1] 'must be ascribed to the age of Rameses III, and it was already with the Philistines that the Israelites came into conflict under almost the earliest of their judges.' As a matter of fact, the Philistines are mentioned long before the period of the judges, in connexion with Abraham (Genesis xxi. 32-34), and Isaac (Genesis xxiv. 1-18), and elsewhere. Prof. Macalister, in his *Philistines* (p. 39), explains the matter in a sensible way, that clears the sacred text from any charge of error :—

> The use of the word 'Philistine' in these stories has long been recognized as an anachronism. Perhaps with less harshness and equal accuracy we might characterize it as a rather free use of modern names and circumstances in telling an ancient tale. Even now we might find, for example, a popular writer on history saying that this event or that of the Early British period took place 'in Norfolk,' although it is obvious that the territory of the North Folk must have received its Saxon name in later times. The tales of Abraham and Isaac were written when the land where their scenes were laid was in truth the Land of the Philistines; and the story-teller was not troubled with the question as to how far back that occupation lasted.

If, then, the early occurrence of the term 'Philistine' can be explained by the popular character of the narrative in the case of Genesis, so it can be in Judges. Nevertheless it is not clear that we need to fall back on this solution. Is it really certain that, as Prof. Sayce asserts, 'the Philistine settlement in Canaan must be ascribed to the age of Rameses III'? The actual disturbances which caused their invasion of South Palestine began in the fourteenth century, and Rameses II himself felt the pressure of the moving of the peoples.[2] Prof. Flinders Petrie[3] is uncertain whether the Philistines of Rameses III came from Palestine or Crete, but inclines to the latter; may they not have had a footing in Palestine also? To such attacks—half raid and half settlement—the Saxon and Danish invasions of England would appear to offer some parallel.

---

[1] Ibid, p. 91.
[2] Macalister, *Philistines*, pp. 18-20.
[3] *History of Egypt*, vol. iii. p. 151.

We come to another difficulty, raised, for example, by Driver [1]: the Tel-el-Amarna letters show that about 1400 B.C. 'Palestine was still an Egyptian province, under the rule of Egyptian governors; the entry of the Israelites into Canaan could not, consequently, have taken place till after 1400 B.C.' About the Tel-el-Amarna tablets we need here say no more than that 'they were letters from monarchs of western Asia, like Kadashman-Kharbe, King of Babylon; Ashuruballit, King of Assyria; and Tushratta, King of Mittanni, to Amenophis III, or Amenophis IV, Kings of Egypt, or they were despatches from various governors or princes of Syria or Palestine, Philistia, or Phœnicia, to these same Egyptian kings, whom they acknowledged as lawful rulers or suzerains over their territories.' [2] Driver does not even mention the possibility, discussed by many, that the 'Khabiri' mentioned in these inscriptions may be the Hebrews invading under Josue. It appears to be generally admitted that there is no difficulty in equating the names, and, if we allow for the vast difference in the point of view, it appears not unreasonable to equate much of their deeds also. The story of the invasion as told in Holy Writ is only a bare summary, and in these letters we should in any case have merely some odd references to it from the fearful victims, so that some rein must be given to historical imagination in attempting a reconciliation. Dr. Rogers [3] is chiefly impressed with the chronological difficulty of the identification; but is there not here some danger of a vicious circle? We have already sufficiently seen that, as far as the biblical chronology itself goes, this early date is that which does least violence to the text. However, there is a formidable difficulty still awaiting us, and it may be that which Dr. Rogers has chiefly in view. And so, too, may Dr. Skinner in his *Genesis* (p. 218), though he likewise refrains from mentioning the fact. He actually feels bound to postulate an invasion of Palestine by the ancestors of the Israelites in the fifteenth century B.C., but will not suppose the Exodus an already accomplished fact. 'There is thus a strong probability,' he writes, 'that "*ibhrim* Hebrews was originally the name of a group of tribes which invaded Palestine in the fifteenth century B.C., and that it was afterwards applied to the Israelites as the sole historic

[1] *Genesis*, Introduction, p. xxix.
[2] R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 254.
[3] Ibid, p. 260.

survivors of the immigrants.' Here, too, the chronological difficulty is imagined to be insuperable, although the synchronism is precisely what could most easily be squared with the Scripture record.[1]

The last difficulty upon which we shall touch is the most serious, and it shall be stated quite frankly. In Exodus i. 11 we read that the Israelites 'built for Pharaoh store cities, Pithom and Raamses'—so the Revised Version, following the Hebrew. Now it is contended that 'the excavations of M. Naville have shown that Rameses II, of the nineteenth dynasty, was the builder of Pithom; and the name of the other city, though it is still not certainly identified, is sufficient evidence that he was its founder likewise.'[2] Rameses II appears to have been reigning during the first half of the thirteenth century B.C.,[3] so that if the Israelites built for him, the Exodus cannot have been as early as the middle of the fifteenth century. M. Naville's witness, it should be noticed, is very explicit:—

> The founder of the city, the king who gave to Pithom the extent and the importance we recognize, is certainly Rameses II. I did not find anything more ancient than his monuments. It is possible that before his time there may have been here a shrine consecrated to the worship of Tum, but it is he who built the enclosure and the storehouses; he is the only king whose name appears on the naos and on the monuments of Ismailiah. Nowhere is it said, as on the monolith of Abou Seyfeh, that he restored constructions of former kings.[4]

'Other monuments' are mentioned, which may be those already here indicated as difficulties; at all events, the chief difficulties actually raised have here been reproduced. But it is what M. Naville has to tell us about Pithom itself that seems the most formidable of all. Are we simply to accept Rameses II as the Pharaoh of the Oppression? The opinion of such a distinguished Egyptologist is not lightly to be rejected, and he has borne such willing witness in his *Archæology of the Old Testament* to the general trustworthiness of the Penta-

---

[1] Some 'Khabiri' appear to have been found 'some six centuries before the era of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets,' in Babylonia (*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* for 1916, pp. 140, 141). But the name ('the men from across') might fit many tribes at different times, and it is not clear that this has any important bearing on what has been written above.

[2] Driver, *Genesis*, Introduction, p. xxix.

[3] Cf. p. 73.

[4] Naville, *The Store-City of Pithom*, p. 18.

teuch in matters Egyptian, that he can scarcely be accused of any unhealthy bias in the matter. Nor would it be right to commit the Church herself to an opposite view, in a matter so obscure and from every point of view undecided; indeed, the French *Crampon* Bible, for instance, notes that the Pharaoh of Exodus ii. 15 is 'probably' Rameses II, and Father Hugh Pope, O.P., in his *Catholic Students' Aids* leans at least as much towards the later date for the Exodus as towards the earlier one which we have given. Still, this entails treating the biblical figures very cavalierly, and, as regards the non-biblical data, we have already found twice over that the hypothesis of a late Exodus compels the experts to assume Israelites in Palestine before it (pp. 74, 77-78). It is, therefore, worth while to consider carefully whether this last difficulty be indeed absolutely insuperable.

Sometimes the best way to attack a problem is to suppose it already solved, and then to consider the implications of the solution. This method we may apply to the present case, without pressing unduly any one particular method of reconciliation. Let us, then, suppose that the Israelites built these cities much earlier, say for the conqueror Thothmes III. In the Egyptian monuments no record exists of their having done so; but then there is nothing in these same monuments to tell us that they did so for Rameses II either. We should presumably have to suppose that Rameses II was restoring the store-cities; there does not seem to be any cogent proof that he was bound to mention the fact if he did so. Indeed, several eminent scholars, including M. Naville himself, identify Raamses, the second store-city, with Zoan, a city greatly enlarged by Rameses II, but originally built much earlier.[1] The name was therefore changed, and we could well imagine the later name slipping into the text in the days when it was in vogue. An argument from silence is seldom absolutely trustworthy; in this case we have to reconcile ourselves to much silence on the side of the pagan records in any case. We could even imagine the epithet 'store-cities' coming in with the later names; but, on the other hand, Thothmes III was a great Asiatic conqueror himself, and may have felt the need of them no less than Rameses.

---

[1] Cf. Driver's note on Exodus i. 11 (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*).

And there we may leave the question, without pretending to offer here a certain solution of all difficulties, any more than in the case of some previous essays on the Pentateuch. Yet on the whole it appears wisest to hold on to the obviously biblical system of chronology, while not denying the presence of real difficulties. We can but endeavour to weigh carefully both what the experts have to tell us of the monumental evidence, and what the Church and the Holy See have to teach us in the handling of Holy Writ. One pious wish the consideration of such problems as this leaves strong within us—the wish that Catholic studies may be so efficiently organized as to produce first-rate experts in all the various departments of biblical research.

Note.—Since the above was first written an important edition of the Book of Judges has been published by Prof. Burney, of Oxford (Rivington, 1918), the final effect of which it is not easy as yet to forecast. On the whole the new evidence which he brings to bear upon the question appears to strengthen the case for an early exodus, though his own hypothesis would limit the historic exodus to the House of Joseph (pp. ciii.-cxviii.). It is hardly necessary to point out how entirely such a view contradicts the only direct evidence on the matter. On the other hand, in another recent work of importance (*Nile and Jordan*, by the Rev. G. A. Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E.: London, Clarke, 1921; pp. 137-8), a strong case is made out for supposing that, as is suggested above, Pithom was merely restored by Rameses II.

GENESIS AND EVOLUTION.

As the heading of this essay sounds a little ambitious, it may be as well to state at once its proper scope. Taking the ascertained facts of science and those theories which are held to be probably true at the present day, it will be our purpose to examine the relations of these scientific conclusions with the cosmic narratives in Genesis, as well as with the doctrine of the Church. Hence no attempt will be made to offer detailed criticism of the scientific speculations current to-day; but merely to outline the general features of the doctrine of Evolution, so as to be able to fix the Catholic point of view all the more accurately. The term 'evolution' has acquired a great number of meanings, which it will be more convenient to keep quite distinct the one from the other. We find the most general and most widely held meaning to be that of Descent or Development. By this theory nearly all naturalists to-day understand that if all the individual plants and animals which exist and have ever existed on the globe were to be viewed together, it would be impossible to arrange them in groups or species at all, since they would be found to form one continuous series of gradations. In other words, naturalists consider the present varieties of animals and of plants to be the transformed derivations from some original type or types of living organism; and the present species are even now being imperceptibly changed into other, quite different, forms.

This theory, which is held by almost all naturalists of note, rests on three main lines of argument, derived from observed facts of natural history :—

(1) *Comparative anatomy* goes to show that animals exhibit several distinct types of structure, which in fact mark off the main divisions of the Animal Kingdom. Within any one of these main divisions may be found almost endless structural diversities, all of them obviously different modifica-

tions of the same fundamental plan. Thus, for example, the fore-leg of a lizard, the wing of a bird and of a bat, the burrowing shovel of a mole, the flipper of a whale, the fore-leg of a horse, and the human arm and hand can be readily shown, despite their apparent disparity, to belong to the same plan, so modified as to serve different uses—running, flying, burrowing, swimming, and grasping.

The argument is strengthened by the observation of so-called rudimentary organs and degenerative processes. Amongst the former are to be classed those structures which subserve no function whatever, and whose only meaning in this contention is that they are vestiges of former organs whose functions had ceased to be of advantage to the species. Thus, in the whale-tribe, while the fore-limbs have been converted into swimming paddles, the hind-limbs appear outwardly to have vanished completely. Internal examination, however, shows traces of hip, thigh, and shin-bone in the Greenland Right Whale; of the hip-bone and of a minute rudiment of the thigh-bone in the Fin-whale; while in the toothed whales only an almost unrecognizable remnant of the hip-bone is left; and in one of the dolphins even this vestige has disappeared.

Of degenerative processes a striking instance is that of the parasite Saeculina, the body of which in the adult form is reduced to a mere bag with root-like fibres through which nourishment is absorbed from its host. However, when its development is observed, it is found that from the egg a free-swimming larva is hatched, possessing jointed appendages, nervous, muscular, and digestive systems, just as complicated as that of a barnacle; the adult form being a degenerative process due to parasitic conditions. It would be impossible to account for this development, it is argued, on any other hypothesis than that of evolutionary adaptation.

(2) *Historical Geography* taken in its widest sense of space and time, proves that fossil remains of animals are not evenly distributed among the one or two hundred thousand feet or so of deposits; but that invertebrate animals are the first to be observed among the most ancient strata, to be followed in due order by fishes, amphibious animals, reptiles, birds, mammals, and finally man in the most recent of deposits. This order, it should be noticed, corresponds with the degree of complexity of the classes described; and the impression made on the investigator is that of a constant, though not always uniform, advance and progress from the

most ancient times. The following table may be taken to outline roughly our present knowledge of the facts :—

Palaeozoic.	*Mesozoic.*	*Cainozoic.*
Vegetation—gigantic cryptogams.	Vegetation—chiefly conifer.	Vegetation—modern.
Animals—fishes (ganoids and sharks).	Fishes—mostly ganoids and cycads and sharks.	Fishes—bony appear in in late Mesozoic and onwards.
No birds.	Age of reptiles—20 orders.	Reptiles—only 5 orders.
No mammals.	Birds—few and primitive.	Birds—modern.
Invertebrates profuse.	Mammals—very tiny.	Mammals—well developed.

However, many of these fully-developed types appear suddenly and unheralded in the geological strata, so that a gradual change from less perfect to better developed forms is not proved. But naturalists appeal to factors of immigration and to the incompleteness of the data as yet observed. This contention receives support from the present distribution of living organisms, inasmuch as they are found to be closely connected with the distribution of fossils and the geological record of the strata. Take, for instance, the existing mammals of South America: two groups can be readily made out, one of exclusively indigenous animals (e.g., the monkeys and marmosets); and a second one containing animals which are closely related to those which now live, as they formerly lived, in North America. The geology of the Isthmus shows that South America was formerly cut off from the northern continent, and in the strata which represent this state of isolation, not a single fossil has been found that was ancestral to the second group of mammals: while ancestral remains of the latter are to be found in the strata succeeding the union of the two continents. Migration and ancestral development, it is maintained, are clearly demonstrated.

Analogous evidence is obtained from the fauna of islands. The continental islands which can be shown geologically to have formed part of the continent, e.g., Great Britain, Madagascar, Borneo, Sumatra, and Java, share in its fossils and present forms, and this in proportion as the separation took place in more or less recent epochs. The Oceanic Islands on the other hand, although fully capable of sustaining life, have only been populated by chance migrations such as driftwood and wind-storms may carry with them. Thus spiders,

flies, bugs, beetles, butterflies, and lizards abounded in Krakatsa shortly after the great eruption of 1883, which buried all life under a deep layer of volcanic debris; but no land mammals (except bats, which are often carried immense distances by strong gales), are to be found in those parts which have not been artificially introduced by man.

(3) *Embryology*, difficult as it is in its interpretation and liable to abuse, still affords additional evidence which is claimed by naturalists for the theory of descent. It reveals the fact that all forms begin as unicellular organisms, and pass through stages which are hardly distinguishable one from another in the various types. The number of stages also, in individual development, is proportional to the complexity of the adult form. Thus, not only such widely divergent animals as fishes, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals exhibit the same plan of development before reaching their adult form, but also this development seems to show stages corresponding to its grade in the scale of complexity. For example, the embryo of a mammal has gill-pouches, skeletal supports, arteries, and veins and heart, like a fish; at a later stage its structure is that of the lung-fishes.

Further, embryology helps to connect the various orders, which are not shown to be related by the evidence already outlined, e.g., the segmented worms and the shell-fish possess closely similar types of larvæ; the lancelet and tunicates are shown to be linked with vertebrates as well as invertebrates.

Such is the bare outline of the copious evidence which scientists consider to be explained by the Theory of Descent. If, they argue, the existing animals and plants had been created as they are now, all these facts would be mere puzzles. If, however, the existing types are transformations of more primitive organism, then it is possible to connect all these converging lines of argument into an intelligent whole.

It is essential to note that this theory does not in any way exclude creation; indeed, Cuvier and Agassiz, who upheld special creation and immutability of species, were forced to admit a systematic creative plan to explain the palæontological data then known.

Secondly, it should be kept in mind that what scientists purpose here is a theory, held, it is true, to be most probable, but yet as unproved—some say unprovable—and from the very nature of the case capable of modification or even rejection, should future evidence and research demand it.

Indeed, it is significant that an eminent professor in Zoology —however isolated he may be—could say, ' The more deeply I pursued the alleged evidence for it (this theory) and sought to gain. through special investigation, some essential proof of the genetic relationships of animals, the more clearly I recognised that the theory is a seductive romance, which deceptively pretends to give results and explanations, rather than a doctrine built upon positive foundations.' [1] In fact, no indubitable cases of species-formation, i.e., of transformation from one species to the other have been observed.

Even if the few cases put forward by evolutionists could be proved to be absolute new productions of species, they are too few, even if multiplied a hundredfold, to be advanced as an ' objective ' proof of the transformistic descent by transformation of the millions of species known to science. The theory of descent does connect in a rational manner all the facts of nature which naturalists have grouped together under the titles of ' homology,' ' palæontological succession,' ' ontogeny ' and ' geographical distribution ' outlined above, but it does not explain all, nor in fact, the most important parts of the facts known, e.g., the sudden appearances of the Cambrian fauna, the origin of the fishes in Silurian strata, the existence of highly specialized types from earliest times, the lack of imperfect ancestral systems to the rich forms of post-Silurian flora, the fact that ' the fundamental structures of types ' persist throughout, though these may differ considerably one from another. ' Never before has it become so notorious as in the last decade, how little there is in this theory that is universally accepted, as appears when the most obvious questions are asked regarding the course of development and its efficient causes.'[2]

Hence many naturalists would postulate a common origin of all living organisms, not from one ancestral type but from several, so as to account more readily for the numerous missing links in the evolutionary descent. This would leave a possibility open, namely, that what naturalists call ' species ' are not true species in the strict sense of the term, but the modified varieties of species as yet unrecognised. As a matter of fact, naturalists admit that the term ' species ' as used in

[1] Albert Fleischmann, Prof. at Erlangen, in his *Die Descendenztheorie*, Leipzig, 1901, p. iii.

[2] Steinmann: *Die Abstammungslehre*, pp. 1-2. Leipzig, 1908.

natural history is a very vague and elastic concept, dependent more on the subjective whims of the classifying zoologist, than on a uniform objective standard of essential properties.

While all naturalists accept and are agreed as to the significance of the theory of descent, there is at the present time a heated controversy with regard to the causes which produce the evolutionary transformations and the reasons why the progressive graduations met with in fossils do not present those irregularities which should be expected from chance productions, but progress instead in one direction only and appear to be teleological in character.

Darwin had formulated, modestly enough, the principle of natural selection, or ' survival of the fittest ' as Spencer put it, without, however, stating anything about ' the origin of fitness.' Before his epoch-making enunciation, Lamarck (1744-1829) had stated that an orderly and progressive evolution was due to transmission of acquired characters; while Buffon (1707-1788), Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802) had recognised other influences at work in the modification of existing types, such as adaptation to environment, the use and disuse of organs. De Vries brought to light again the discovery of Mendel, that variation occurred along definite lines, not by any ever-present fluctuating variations in the struggle for existence, but by spontaneous and sudden changes, on which the other factors would act as selective guides, or like a sieve, determining which varieties were to live, and which to die.

The discussion has been obscured by the further issues as to the nature and the origin of life; whether life is a mere physico-chemical process; whether evolution is the result of causo-mechanical agency between the sensitive organism and its surroundings; or whether it is not rather the outcome of inherent forces which are only stimulated to action by environmental influences, and are not caused by them.

That there is absolutely no scientific evidence for spontaneous generation cannot be called into question at the present day, indeed, the researches of Pasteur and his collaborators and the whole science of pathology and preventive medicine go to confirm this its fundamental axiom: *omne vivum e vivo*. Even if spontaneous generation were a proved fact, the question of the origin of life would still remain an open one from the scientific point of view, until the disputed sufficiency of physico-chemical processes to explain all the phenomena of life were settled. It should be

noted that these two principles do not pertain solely to biology, but fall within the sphere of psychological science, especially as biology ignores completely all differences in psychic activities in the zoo-phytic groupings.

The debate remains open, for though the experimental evidence seems to be in favour of the indivisibility and distinctness of unit species-characteristics, still the causo-mechanical theory of selectionists is not considered to have been proved untenable.

From a zoological point of view, man is an animal, and it is natural that zoologists should seek to find man's place in the zoological scale and to enquire how far he can be made to fit in with existing evolutionary theories. As far as his anatomical structure is concerned, the human organism is obviously related to the higher apes, so much so that the structural differences between the higher apes and their lower types are greater than the structural differences between themselves and man. Some zoologists have, therefore, maintained that man is but an ape—the highest ape known. But zoology ignores completely psychic factors which do not come within its scope; and therefore zoology is incompetent to judge of the significance of such factors. Even if the body of man had been exactly similar to that of an ape, the psychic factors would be sufficient to show that similarity of bodily form does not necessarily argue to identity of whole individuality—much more so when the bodily differences themselves, slight as they are from a zoological point of view, are those demanded by the all-important subservience to the psychic factors.

Assuming that anatomically man is related to the higher apes, the next point to decide is (A), whether there is any evidence of evolution in the human organism; and (B), whether this evolution has proceeded from ape-like ancestors or otherwise.

(A) The arguments adduced for the evolution of mankind are the same as those shown above for the theory of descent. If man is an animal, and animals have developed one from another, it is reasonable to suppose that man also has followed the general law of Nature. Moreover, man also exhibits rudimentary organs, such as the coccyx (and the appendix?); his embryological development falls within the scope of the phylogenetic argument outlined above, and the different races of men show structural differences which are

related to their mental development especially in their cranial capacity, and the anatomical structure of the skull.

(B) Still, the chief evidence is to be sought for in geological history; for our ascertained evolution in times past would certainly overcome the weaknesses in the other lines of argument. As was to be expected, the debate among scientific men has been keenest on this point, in fact, several remains were discovered, and the conclusions arrived at by the specialists who examined them are not altogether concordant. Undoubted human remains were found in Gibraltar (Lerbes Quarry—1848—fragmentary skull); at Neanderthal (Düsseldorf, Germany—1856—skull-cap and skeletal fragments); at Spy (near Dinant, Belgium—1887—two skulls and skeletons); at Lipka (Moravia—1882—jaw of a child); at Krapina (Croatia, Austria-Hungary—1899—portions of many skeletons of adults and children); and also in several other parts of France, especially that of a nearly entire skeleton discovered in 1908 by the Abbés Bouyssonie at La Chapelle aux Saints, Corrèze. Though the statements made are conflicting, it appears that all these remains are evidence of a race of men (*Homo neanderthalensis, H. primigenius, H. mousteriensis, etc.*—but, none the less, the selfsame *Homo sapiens* of to-day), which flourished in mid-Pleistocene times. More recent races assigned to Upper Palæolithic times have also been described, such as the Grimaldi, a race of negroids, championed by Verneau; the Cro-Magnons extending over Wales, France, Italy, Spain and Austria; the Brünn races in Moravia and Hungary, to which perhaps the Gibraltar man may have belonged; etc. In all cases, the skeletons and associated implements and (by no means contemptible) objects of art found exhibit man, as known to-day—somewhat different in structural type, it is true, but immeasurably above the rest of his fellow-creatures by his intellectual capacities. Neanderthaloid type of skulls may be seen even to-day in every city of Europe; and famous men have been likened to these supposed primitive types, e.g., St. Martin, Bp. of Toul, IV Cent.; the warrior Bruce, and others.

A heated controversy has raged with regard to three discoveries made by Dr. Dubois at Trinil, in Java, in 1891; by Dr. Schoetensack at Mauer, near Heidelberg, in 1908; and that by Mr. Dawson at Piltdown, near Fletching, in Sussex.

'Dr. Eugène Dubois, who had left Holland for Java with the avowed intention of finding the "missing link," dis-

covered in September, 1891, a molar tooth (m/3 right side), the wisdom tooth of *Pithecanthropus erectus*; a month later, between three or four feet away from the tooth, the cranial vault or the skull-cap was found lying in the same bed, and on the same horizon. Work was then suspended on account of the rainy season, but was resumed in May of the following year, and in August the thigh-bone of the left leg was found lying fifty feet away from the spot where the first tooth was obtained, but still on the same horizon; and finally, in October, another molar tooth [1] (m/2 left side) lying ten feet away from the skull-cap.' [2] As for their significance, German specialists assert that they are simian. English experts describe them as human, while French anthropologists regard them as standing mid-way between man and apes. As a matter of fact, besides the impossibility of proving that the femur and skull-cap belong to the same individual, there is the further assumption that the individual was a healthy representative of his race, and not merely one of those unfortunate microcephalic idiots who are to be met with in every one of the well-populated asylums of Europe of to-day.

The Heidelberg find consists of a massive lower jaw, with broad ascending arms and a receding chin, which places it mid-way between that of an anthropoid ape and *Homo sapiens*. However, the dentition is completely human, and in some respects less simian than that which may sometimes be observed in existing primitive races. A further point which called forth a great discussion at the time is the absence of a spine on the inner aspect of the chin, which was said to be exclusively simian, and to denote inability of speech, but has now been proved to be absent amongst modern African and other races, who are known to speak European languages beside their own.

From this jaw, the whole man has been reconstructed by imaginative artists, even though the scientific evidence is so utterly deficient. Before any far-reaching conclusions can be arrived at, it will have to be shown that receding chins do not exist at the present day, and that the Heidelberg jaw was a normal jaw typical of an extinct race of man-like apes or ape-like men.

---

[1] According to Dr. W. B. Pearsall, this is a wisdom tooth, and worn away after the manner of wisdom teeth of baboons and other apes.

[2] Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, ed. 2, p. 33.

The Piltdown skull found by Mr. Dawson, together with part of the lower jaw, was the occasion of much speculation, until the jaw was shown to belong to an adult chimpanzee, by the discovery of a canine tooth by Father Teilhard. Thus, the strange creature, which was supposed to have a human skull and an ape's jaw, turns out to be just one more specimen of *Homo* as we know him to-day; and who, moreover, may have used that monkey's jaw as a tool just as present-day aborigines do.

Thus, one may conclude that ' the order of succession in time of fossil remains of the Mammalia, and especially of apes and man, suggests that man in the strictest sense, *Homus sapiens*, is a creature of Pleistocene time; as we look backwards into the past we lose sight of him before the close of that age, and encounter in his place forms specifically and even generically distinct; that other species of the human family *might* have already come into existence in the Pliocene epoch seems possible, but scarcely in the Miocene, and still less in the Oligocene epoch.' [1] That is to say, that as far as *ascertained scientific facts* are concerned, the earliest known men are structurally alike to the present-day races of men, and show themselves endowed with those faculties which make *Homo sapiens* the primate on earth. Mere brain capacity and large skulls do not in the least prove a greater share of intellectual powers—as a glance at the numerous large-headed imbeciles and idiots inside and outside of lunatic asylums will show. Moreover, concurrently with the earliest discoveries of human remains, marvellous works of art have been found which, it may safely be said, few of our professors of anthropology could rival. Even primitive flint instruments show ingenuity in handicraft, *Homo sapiens* is already using his wits with effect.

In attempting to determine the Catholic exegete's attitude towards these facts and theories, the wise principles of Leo XIII must be kept well in mind :

(' The expositor of Holy Scriptures) must not consider . . . that it is forbidden, when just cause exists, to push inquiry and exposition beyond what the Fathers have done, provided he carefully observes the rule so wisely laid down by St. Augustine—not to depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires; a rule to which it is the more necessary to adhere

[1] Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, ed. 2, p. 85.

strictly in these times, when the thirst for novelty and the unrestrained freedom of thought makes the danger of error most real and proximate.' [1]

From this it seems to follow that apart from dogmatic definitions, which are irrevocable because they have been recognised to be truths revealed by God, the Church is not unwilling to accept scientific discoveries, so long as these discoveries are ascertained facts and not mere transitory speculations. It is reasonable, in the latter case, to expect the Church to cling to the letter of the Scriptural texts until morally certain grounds can be adduced to show that the literal interpretation must be abandoned. Still, even then, the exegete may enquire how far he is committed to the literal interpretation of the text, and what figurative meanings would be possible 'on the analogy of faith,' that is to say, having in view the definitive and ordinary teaching of the Church.

From what has been said above on the Theory of Descent it should be evident that, apart from the question of man's descent, the Book of Genesis is in no way incompatible with such a theory. In another essay it is shown that the first chapter of Genesis must be taken to be a quasi-poetical presentation of the main facts of Creation, rather than a chronological scientific description of events. It has even been asserted that St. Augustine and the Schoolmen accepted evolutionism. It would seem, however, that what St. Augustine and the Schoolmen had in view was not evolution of species, but rather the inclusion of all individuals, past, present and to come in the creative act, *seminaliter* and *potentialiter*, so as to interpret better the words of Genesis, 'and on the seventh day God rested.' However this may be, it has been shown in the article referred to that no certain conclusion can be drawn from the Book of Genesis either with regard to the number of species created or with reference to the period which separated the creation of plant and animal life from that of man. Creation by God is the central lesson of the whole narrative.

To the Theory of Descent, then, apart from the question of man, there appears to be no insuperable theological

[1] Encycl. "Providentissimus Deus," 18th Nov., 1893. It is very instructive in this connection to follow the discussions about the Piltdown and Neanderthal remains; and to compare such books on Evolution as Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* with Scott: *The Theory of Evolution*.

difficulty; theologically the worst that could be said against it is perhaps this, that it appears to create a prejudice in favour of the bodily evolution of man himself. But the fact that a hypothesis does not conflict with revelation is, of course, no sign that it is true; it still has to stand the test of facts known by unaided reason. Enough has, perhaps, been said above to show these facts are not such as to exclude reasonable doubt, if the theory be considered in its extreme form.

As for man, there is no scientific proof that he evolved out of ape-like ancestors. Even if the facts alleged were incontrovertible, it would only mean that God in creating man fashioned his body according to the existing laws of nature and in the semblance of the highest organism extant, in accordance with the purpose which God intended for man. Indeed, it may be said that God allowed creation to reach its utmost development before creating man—just as He allowed the fulness of time to come into being before descending as God-incarnate. It should be borne in mind that the great difficulty about the relationship of man and apes is not that they are so similar in bodily structure, but rather in that they are not wholly similar in physical structure. For materialists are thus given a chance to argue that the immense psychological differences between man and the ape depend wholly on the slight anatomical differences in brain capacity and the like. What constitutes the essential specific feature in man is his psychic activities; and no mere bodily evolutionism can affect the creative act described in Genesis. What has to be proved is just that which is so commonly assumed in popular presentations of evolution, viz., the actual evolution of the psychic functions of man from those of the brute.

Thus the creative act mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis and culminating in the creation of man, remains unaffected by what is alleged by the evolutionists. In fact, the Holy Scriptures are too explicit in the statement of God's creation of man to admit of any continuous series of progressive changes from ancestral animals. His deliberation and His direct intervention, forming man, as it were, with His own hands, instead of by a mere word of command; and the infusion of His own breath so as to make him after His own image, as a likeness of Himself—all point to a very special treatment of man, as something quite apart from the rest of His creatures. Nor is this impression unsupported,

for God appoints man as lord of creation, and prepares for him a garden, and recognizes that amongst all God's creatures there was not one meet to stand before man as a help and as a companion in life.

When we endeavour to go further still, we must be careful to distinguish the source of our knowledge. That the human soul is created directly by God is a demonstrated conclusion of sane philosophy, and from a theological standpoint it appears to be heretical to deny it, mainly because of the consistent teaching of the whole Church upon the point, though there is much in Genesis and elsewhere in Holy Writ to favour it. Science teaches it also, since psychology is a true science; science in a narrower sense abstracts from it. But it is evident that most of our knowledge touching the first man comes to us from revelation alone, and in the main from the Book of Genesis and St. Paul, with the comment of tradition. That the human race actually springs from a single pair, for example, is clearer from St. Paul than from Moses, and is an article of faith, because taught as an essential part of the doctrine of original sin. This is one of the doctrines which the Biblical Commission (June, 1909) bids us hold fast; the other three which more immediately concern us—though the enumeration is not intended to be exhaustive—are 'the creation of all things by God at the beginning of time: the special creation of man: the formation of the first woman from the first man.' As regards the first heading, 'all things' is not intended, of course, to cover souls created later. It might, perhaps, be going too far to say that it is of faith that Adam's body was produced by immediate creation; nevertheless, this is the more obvious sense of Genesis, and the Biblical Commission has only reinforced the general opinion of fathers and theologians.[1] And the same is true of the story of the formation of Eve's body, as narrated in the Book of Genesis; we can hardly say that it is of faith, yet it has Scripture and tradition and authority behind it. True, it may sound like folklore, but may not such folklore proceedings, if we may reverently call them such, have been more intelligible to primitive man; and may not God have deliberately acted folklore for this reason? Such, at all events, is the story that God has told us; and His Church bids us take it as fact.

[1] It must be admitted, however, that this is only 'the more obvious sense' of the Biblical Commission, as of Genesis.

Larger questions of supernatural import we leave alone; that Fall which preceded all human evolution, such as it was to be, and also that developing of ' the full stature of Christ ' which runs parallel to simply natural progress, whether again merely external or to some extent—if education bills be not wholly futile—intellectual. The end of man is union with Christ in His Mystical Body, and to that end all men and all things, past, present and future, are ordained by God. And thus Christ is fulfilled in His members : they are built up to their full measure, ever increasing in number in this world, and still more in the next : they are built up in fuller unity, the absorbing and incorporating power of the organism increasing to meet the need : they are built up in more perfect knowledge, as the Church penetrates ever more deeply into the mind of Her Divine Spouse. For evolution truly divine we must turn before all to the Epistle to the Ephesians.

THE RELIGION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

It can hardly be expected that the limits of this article will not involve gaps in the treatment of so extensive and important a subject. Attention will, consequently, be confined to the larger issues: the nature and worship of God; the human soul, with its relation to God and a future life; the faith necessary to guide the soul in its progress towards that goal; Sin—the great obstacle that checks such progress—with the correlative dogma of Redemption; lastly, the manner in which these truths were put into practice by the chief personages of the narrative, and the whole question of the morality of the books.

The Catholic, controlled in his interpretation of Scripture by divinely appointed authority, is preserved in studying the subject of these lines from the common error of seeing in similarity of primitive cult a necessary identity of origin, such as totemism, ancestor-worship, or polydæmonism. Such theories, it is true, as that food-taboos are to be found in the 'unclean' animals of the Pentateuch, or again that ancestor-worship is traceable, e.g., in mourning-customs, funeral repasts and the importance attached to tombs, might speculatively, without prejudice to the Catholic position, be credited with as much truth as could be vindicated by their defenders. Abraham was called by God from a polytheistic family (Josue xxiv. 2-3; Judith v. 6-9), and he must have had hard work to eradicate from the companions of his wanderings age-long pagan beliefs and customs. But that such was the only religious equipment of the Israelites in patriarchal times, that there was no direct intervention of God but only natural religious progress, cannot possibly be maintained, unless the sole historical evidence we have is to be set aside and replaced by sheer hypothesis.

Hence, also, theories that make the God of the Israelites a mere glorification of some local deity must be rejected. The idea that certain stones, trees and springs are consecrated to

Yahweh is natural enough. The cool shade and refreshing water would be of inestimable value in nomad life, and where Abraham found such convenient resting-places he would naturally seize the opportunity of paying definite worship to his newly-revealed God. After his time, they became sanctified by his having adored there. Altars were built, pillars erected and anointed, and the Lord's name invoked—a rite resembling, as far as it went, the pagan, but in no way necessarily involving worship of the local pagan deities. It is alleged that the scenes of this patriarchal worship were peculiarly sacred to such deities, but even if the Canaanite oak at Sichem (Gen. xii. 6-7), the Amorrhite oak at Mambre (Gen. xiii. 18), and the mountain at Bethel (Gen. xii. 8), were dedicated to pagan worship, and this is hypothesis, there would be no disloyalty to Yahweh if Abraham erected there his primitive altars, especially seeing that they were memorable to him from divine visitations. Perhaps the evergreen tamarisk at Beersabee (Gen xxi. 33) symbolished for him the God of Ages. Jacob buried the strange gods of his household under the turpentine-tree at Sichem (Gen. xxxv. 4), but this is explicit rejection of any God save Yahweh.

Again, when he sets up a ' mazzebah ' (the name given to the sacred pillars of the heathen) and anoints it at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 18), it is the place that is sacred because of his vision. His thoughts are full of the sacredness of the spot : ' Indeed, the Lord is in this place and I knew it not. . . . How terrible is this place! This ' (the place, and not the stone) ' is no other but the house of God and the gate of heaven.' Though he proceeds to call the stone itself ' the house of God,' his words must be understood in the light of what he has already said. Besides, when he returns to fulfil his vow by building an altar, it is expressly the place that is called Bethel. It might be added that a ' mazzebah ' was set up on Rachel's tomb (Gen xxxv. 20), but there is no evidence of tombs being a place of worship.

The spring at Cades is probably sacred, and called ' the spring of judgment,' not because of a local deity, but owing to the decisions given there later by Moses; while it is the appearance of the same Yahweh who led Abraham from Ur that sanctifies ' the well of him that liveth and seeth.'

As against the above crude idea of the God of the patriarch, it is clear that the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though in early times His theophanies are in accord-

ance with the character of a primitive people, is the God of Moses, Isaiah and St. John. The words of Exod. vi. 3, probably do not mean that the mere name Yahweh was unknown to the patriarchs, but that henceforth His manifestations to Moses and the Israelites will be made under a special aspect denoted by that name. What that aspect was is not altogether clear. The name is, it seems, third person imperfect derived from the old form of the verb ' to be ' (*Hawah*), and used as a noun. It is explained in Exod. iii. 14, the third person being changed to the first. The form under consideration may be in either the Qal or Hiphil,[1] but the use of the word in the latter is very rare. The Vulgate, Septuagint and Douay Versions all take the grammatical form of continuous time in the present, implying, in the case of God, perpetual existence in past, present and future: ' I am, Who am.' From this it has for long been maintained (such an eminent scholar as Fr. Hetzenauer still represents the view), that the name indicates God's necessary self-existence. Nevertheless, *continuous* action in Hebrew is denoted by the participle; the imperfect, which is given in the Hebrew text of Exod. iii. 14, denotes *reiterated* action[2] (present or past indifferently), or it may refer to the future. If the former alternative be chosen, it would mean either, ' I am wont to be that which I am wont to be ' (present)—which appears to be intended by the Authorised and Revised Versions, ' I am that I am '—or, ' I used to be what I used to be ' (past), this last interpretation giving no sense in the context. The interpretation of present reiterated action, according at least to some of its supporters, besides implying the impossibility of describing Yahweh's nature except by itself, declares His existence as opposed to the non-existence of heathen deities, and further, that it is His nature to be ever manifesting Himself under some fresh aspect. For it is contended that *Hayah* denotes not essential being, but manifestation of being. If the future rendering be adopted, it would mean that God will manifest Himself under the manifold aspects of His attributes, or perhaps under one special aspect. In favour of this last interpretation, it may be pointed out that while the Vulgate, Septuagint, Douay, Authorised and Revised Versions, all take *'ehyeh* in the present, they all render the same word used by

[1] *I.e.*, what may be called the ordinary active voice and the causative voice.

[2] *Cf. Hebrew Grammar*, Gesenius-Kautzsch, 2nd English ed. (Cowley), § 107, d.

God in the very same context (only two verses previously) by the future : ' I will be.' Further, Osee. i. 9, seems to refer fairly definitely to this future rendering.

Before leaving this point of grammar, it should be mentioned, with regard to the meaning itself of the name Yahweh, that conjectures as to the earliest meanings of *hawah* are irrelevant. The concern of the theologian is what was the meaning of this divine name for the Hebrews. Prof. Burney, in his recent edition of the Book of Judges, after tracing (p. 243) the name to the Babylonian *Yahu*, recognised at the time of the first dynasty and probably introduced by the Amorrhite immigrants, is anxious to state clearly that ' the views which he puts forward. . . . as to the early identification of Yahweh with the moon-god Sin,[1] do not, in his opinion, derogate in any respect from the *uniquely new significance*[2] in which the name is related in Exod. iii. to have been revealed to Moses at Horeb. That revelation, with its new exposition of the name . . . . no less than the fulness of moral and spiritual meaning which Israel's prophets and psalmists were inspired to draw from the name in later ages stands unparalleled in the history of Semitic religions; and is wholly unaffected by the fact that the name itself appears to have been known and used in earlier times, and among a wider circle of peoples ' (p. 248 note).

That the Yahweh of Abraham is the Yahweh of Moses does not, it is true, necessarily mean that the patriarch arrived at such a lofty conception of his God. But if, as Prof. Davidson (*Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 110), has pointed out, Moses did not reach the idea of a spiritual God by study or thought, but by direct revelation, why should not the revelation to Abraham have amounted to as much? Anthropomorphism, as the same writer himself says elsewhere, only testifies to strong belief in the personality of God.

What is said of the God of the patriarchs is, even from the Catholic standpoint, the language of a writer no earlier than Moses, but of an inspired Moses who could not represent patriarchal ideas on such vital matters other than they really were. His truthfulness is, in fact, shown by the simplicity of those ideas, which are yet far above the carnal nature often attributed to them.

---

[1] Prof. Burney himself makes it clear how very precarious is this identification.

[2] Italics his.

God showed Himself to the patriarchs as El-Shaddai (Exod. vi. 3), and though no certain meaning can be given the name, in places it seems certainly to convey the thought of power. If omnipotence cannot quite certainly be gathered from it, surely this idea is presented in Gen. xviii. 14: 'Is there anything hard to God?' The God of the patriarchs was also 'The Most High God, Maker (or Possessor) of heaven and earth' (Gen. xiv. 22), and 'He that liveth and seeth' (Gen. xvi. 4, xxxi. 50). He shows Himself the Lord of the earth by His promise of Canaan to the Israelites and His destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha. He is the Supreme Protector of the patriarchs and their reward (Gen. xv. 1, xvii. 2, xix. 12, xxxv. 10, etc.). He is gracious in hearing their prayers (Gen. xviii. 23). He knows the future, as is indicated by His promises, and also by such texts as Gen. xviii. 19.

Further, though it may be true that the early Semites were monolaters rather than monotheists, i.e., though it be granted that, while they paid cult only to one God, they nevertheless recognised many, the only proof that this was so with the Israelites would consist in their having adored other gods continually and officially. Now, was this so? Undoubtedly examples of idolatry are not uncommon in the Pentateuch, but the instances are clearly in conflict with the pure faith in and worship of Yahweh displayed by the patriarchs. The covenant between God and Abraham is intended definitely to sever the Israelites from pagan worship, and Abraham so understands it (Gen. xxiv.). Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 2) expressly rejects the idolatry of his household. For Mosaic times, Catholics, considering the documentary theory, with its concrete implications as to chronology and authorship, untenable, may appeal to the indubitable testimony of Deuteronomy.

As to the general idea of God throughout these books, a fuller treatment than can be here given is necessary if it is to be appreciated. It has been said that 'all other designations of God, and all other assertions respecting Him, and all other attributes assigned to Him' in Scripture, are contained in the two facts predicated of Him in the opening chapters of Genesis, viz., that He is Creator of all that is material and spiritual, and that He is the absolute personality (Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 83).

Now in this passage, though the primary meaning of *bara'* is 'fashioned,' when used in connection with God, it acquires the further meaning 'created'; and the force of the opening

words of Genesis is in the statement that the universe came from Elohim. In both the Qal and Niphal the word is used of creating, and in the former—of which there is question here—it is even confined to divine activity. To restrict attention to the Pentateuch, it is used, besides the passage being dealt with, for God's creation in each instance of beasts (Gen. i. 21), of man and woman (Gen. i. 27, v. 1-2, vi. 7; Deut. iv. 32), of ' a new thing ' (e.g., the earthquake that swallowed up Korah and his followers, Num. xvi. 30).

God is, then, with the early Hebrews, not merely a person of great dignity. He is the Supreme Lord of all, that is, who claims the services of all creatures. He is immutable (Num. xxviii. 19) and omnipresent (Deut. iv. 39). His theophanies—the ' angel,' ' face ' and ' glory ' of Yahweh—indicate His essential invisibility (ep. Exod. xxxiii. 20). His vision is all-embracing (Gen. i.). While He shows Himself, perhaps predominantly, as powerful, just, holy and ' jealous,' or zealous for His honour, He is characteristically good and faithful; He loves His people (Deut. vii. 8, 13), and wills to be loved (Deut. xi. 13); He is ' merciful and gracious, patient, and of much compassion and true ' (Exod. xxxiv. 6). Certain difficulties with regard to His dealings with men will be touched upon when the morality of the Pentateuch is considered.

The doctrinal element of these books comprises also something of value about the soul. The Hebrew for ' spirit ' denotes also ' air,' ' anger,' ' folly.' Even the ' breath of life,' breathed by God into the face of man, is applied equally to animals. However, in Gen. ii. it implies at least ' life,' and there is a significance in the different turn of speech with regard to the creation of man and of the animals; also as regards that of the human body and its vital principle. Of the animals, it is said simply that God ' formed (them) out of the ground ' (Gen. ii. 19); but ' God created man to His own image '—the phrase is emphasised: ' To the image of God he created him ' (Gen. i. 27). Man's body is ' formed . . . . of the slime of the earth,' but then ' the Lord God . . . . breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul ' (Gen. ii. 7). Moreover, man is free, as appears from the story of the Fall, and explicitly from God's words to Cain (Gen. iv. 7) ,and Moses' address to the people (Duet. xxvi. 17, xxx. 11). As for immortality, it is impossible to conceive of God speaking of Himself as the God

of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, if He did not imply that they were after this life to share in His glory. This is Our Lord's own interpretation of the words (Matt. xxii. 31), though it may be that speaking to people of more developed ideas, He did not intend to teach that the patriarchs understood the full significance of the phrase. Again, when the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (c. xi.) interprets the assertion of the patriarchs that they are pilgrims on earth as implying a belief in immortality, this bears out the natural meaning one would attach to their words. It is admitted, moreover, by non-Catholic writers that Sheol is referred to by the phrase to ' go to his fathers,' to ' be gathered to his people,' and Jacob expressly speaks of going down to Sheol. Now the expression cannot have always meant for the writer, at whatever age one supposes he wrote, a place of gloom, and, at best, half-conscious existence, for he puts it into the mouth of God in the form of a blessing (Gen. xv. 15).

To keep alive their ideas of God and whatever notion they had of the next world, the Israelites of patriarchal times, lately snatched from polytheism, had abundant need of faith. Of this virtue Abraham is a conspicuous example : ' Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice ' (Gen. xv. 6). When it seemed impossible for him to have a son, he believed the promise of God. Nevertheless, the faith even of this great patriarch and his wife seems not to have been entirely perfect, as is indicated by the smile of incredulity with which at first both of them received the promise (Gen. xvii. 17, xviii. 10, 12, 13, 15).

Yet there can be no doubt that Abraham's life in general, as portrayed in Genesis and as viewed by St. Paul (Rom. iv. 1-5, Gal. iii. 6, cf. Heb. xi.) and St. James (ii. 21 . . .), was conspicuously one of great faith. It was this faith that produced the unbounded confidence in God shown in his beautifully child-like prayer for the people of Sodom (Gen. xviii. 22). Again, supreme heroism is demanded of him. He goes immediately, ' rising up in the night,' into ' the land of vision,' and is prevented from sacrificing his only son by divine intervention alone (Gen. xxii.). This faith of the father of the Hebrews is depicted in deep relief. ' By My Own Self have I sworn,' said the Lord, ' because thou hast done this thing and hast not spared thy only-begotton son for My sake : I will bless thee, and will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand that is by the sea-shore : thy seed shall

possess the gates of their enemies. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed My voice ' (Gen. xxii. 16).

There is certainly more reason to find fault with Moses in regard to his want of faith (cf. Exod. iv. 14, v. 22-3, xix. 23; Num. xi. 23, xx. 12), but surely even he, in spite of relapses, must have been held to his hard task by faith. It was with danger to his life and after many trials that he liberated the Israelites from the grip of Pharaoh, and conducted this rebellious people for forty years across the desert to the Promised Land. The tendency of the people to relapse is shown only too clearly in the terrible threats of Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., but the faith of their leaders, as shown in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, must be pondered as a comment.

The natural inclination to evil finds its explanation in the story of the Fall, which must now be briefly considered. That its purpose is nothing more than explanation by myth of the origin of sin and death cannot be accepted. The writer, under the guidance of inspiration, has the deliberate intention of recording the earliest historical events.

Although, on the admission of the critics, the parallel with other traditions does not extend to detail, yet so striking is the general similarity, e.g., in the palm of Eridu or the Soma plant that conferred immortality, Ea's injunction to Adapa not to partake of the food and water of life, Azi-Dahaka which ' sprang like a snake out of the sky down to the earth to blight (Ahuramazda's) creation,' and the winged guardians of the Assyrian sacred palm, that it seems likely there is a common meeting-point in the stories. Similar parallels are found with the Flood-Story in the various Babylonian records collected by Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, p. 103, cf., also Langdon's *Sumerian Epic of Paradise*). The various pagan legends may be conceived as imperfect traditions, of a like nature to those which Abraham must have brought with him from Mesopotamia, but from which in course of time, and especially by Moses, under divine guidance, the true was sifted from the false. Similar imperfect traditions seem to underlie beliefs all over the world, such as are so interestingly depicted—though with different intent—by Sir J. Frazer in his recent *Folk-lore of the Old Testament*.

Even so, the tree of knowledge, the speaking serpent, the death-penalty and instantaneous awakening to a sense of

shame attaching to the eating of a fruit, require reverent examination from the point of view of reason. The story of the Fall is not, as has been often maintained, a myth intended to solve problems concerned with daily life, problems, e.g., of 'the darker side of life in an agricultural state of society' (Dr. Skinner in the *International Critical Commentary*), the hard toil of the husbandman, the birth-pangs of mothers and the subjection of woman to man; or, again, of the sense of shame which accompanies adolescence, the use of clothing or the instinctive antipathy to serpents. It is a divinely inspired document intended to convey, as regards its essential doctrine, the history of the first human beings, their original state of immortality and innocence, and their subsequent fall into sin and liability to death.

The idea that Adam and Eve were mere children is contrary to the witness of the narrative, yet, their merely human knowledge being so slight, there should be no difficulty in understanding God to have dealt with this primitive pair as human parents deal with their children. The forbidding of a definite fruit is just such a command as one would have expected, if man's obedience was to be put to the test. As for the trees of knowledge and of life, there is nothing repugnant in God's attaching by virtue of a quasi-sacramental power the acquisition of moral knowledge or the physical gift of immortality to definite trees. But God could not possibly wish to debar our first parents from speculative knowledge of right and wrong, in fact His mere command supposes them already to possess it. Was it, then, what has been called 'experimental' knowledge, in other words the realisation of what it is to sin? On this supposition, how could the tempter have persuaded the woman that such knowledge was to make her like to God? How, again, was she so eager to acquire this knowledge, she hitherto sinless? For the bait of the tempter is precisely the thought of the desirability of the knowledge. On this and other points of the Genesis narrative some very useful suggestions have been made by Canon van Hoonacker, of Louvain University, in the *Expositor* (Nov., 1918).

A last word with regard to the serpent. In view of the curse pronounced (Gen. iii. 14, 15), the 'subtle' creature must have been understood by the sacred writer as representing some spiritual agency provoking to evil. The curse need indicate no more than that the furtive, uncanny procedure of the serpent will henceforth image the cunning of the male-

volent spirit, just as the rainbow stands for the sure symbol of the faithful covenant of God (Gen. ix. 3, cf. Apoc. x. 1-7).

The subject of the Fall leads to discussion of the promised Redeemer. In the protevangelium (Gen. iii. 15), there is symbolised a continual fight between man and the spirit of evil. From the context it is legitimately inferred that the victory will be with man. The seed of the woman shall indeed be wounded, but not mortally, in the spiritual struggle; the seed of the serpent shall be crushed and beaten beyond remedy. For a full exposition of the passage, the reader may be referred to *Christ in Type and Prophecy*, by Fr. Maas, S.J. Here it will suffice to point out that the two expressions 'thy seed,' 'her seed,' being parallel, must both be taken either individually or collectively, and that the latter interpretation seems more correct. From the earliest days of the Church both views have been represented, but it has always been agreed that the primary reference in 'her seed' is to the future Redeemer. However, the exegesis best supported by the original text, parallel Scriptural usage and tradition takes the phrase in a collective sense: mankind in future shall through the victory of the implicitly mentioned individual Redeemer, crush the power of evil. The limitation of this collective sense to those only who actually turn to profit the fruits of the Redeemer's victory is exacted by the context and is paralleled in other places of Scripture (Gen. xxi. 12, Rom. ix. 7). Besides this text there is a series of passages, beginning with the call of Abraham, which rouses the hope of the patriarchs in a spiritual blessing through them on all the nations of the earth (cf. Mass, l.c.). This series is at length gathered up on the death of the last of the patriarchs into a fairly definite prediction of the Messianic privilege of the house of Judah (Gen. xlix. 8-12). There has been much discussion round this text, and justice cannot be fully done to it here. Suffice it to say that the interpretation, 'the Sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah . . . till He come Whose it is,' referring to the Messiah, has the best documentary support and gives the best sense. The application to David, by those who admit this reading as at least possible, cannot stand, because the kingdom had not strictly speaking come to Judah till David's time. Nor is it a personal sceptre that is really in question, but the sceptre of *Judah*, that tribal supremacy and national autonomy which was never really lost till the land came under the sway of the

Herods, and finally under direct Roman government, viz., in the life-time of Our Lord.

Something must now be said of the morality depicted in these books. Non-Catholics find great difficulty in accepting the decalogue as Mosaic precisely because of its elevated moral tone. Accordingly, Kautsch (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) is forced, in order to defend the Mosaic authorship, to explain it as a mere promulgation of rights towards God and neighbour, bereft of all ethical motive. But its high ideal is explained by its divine origin. That it is not in harmony with much of the conduct of the Israelites is only to be expected. Our Lord defended the Mosaic permission of divorce on the ground of the 'hardness of heart' of the people. On the other hand, much of what is done by even the chosen ones of God does not necessarily receive His sanction. As regards polygamy, perhaps the same may be said as above of divorce. Considering the primitive nature of the people, it may be that a lower standard was tolerated in them in the earlier stages of their history. God did not bestow His grace with such fulness as in later times (See John i. 17; Rom. vii.; 1 Cor. xv. 56-7). Whether Jacob's conduct in depriving Esau of his father's blessing is an instance of such a lower standard of morality is not clear. St. Augustine's solution, viz., that he acted and spoke merely figuratively, involves, as Fr. Hetzenauer shows,[1] considerable difficulties. Possibly he, himself, abandoned it afterwards. In his *Retractations* (Lib. I., c. 27), he says he did not wish the *De Mendacio* to be published, and 'much less' the *Contra Mendacium*, which deals with Jacob more fully. It is, however, possible that his reluctance to publish was due to the style of the books. In view of the cynical treatment Jacob has received at the hands of non-Catholic writers, it may be excusable to enter into this question a little more fully than otherwise would be fitting in so synoptic an essay as this.

It must be admitted that Jacob's fear of his father's curse (Gen. xxvii. 12), and Rebecca's appreciation of that fear, as well as Isaac's censure of his son's conduct as deceitful (Gen. xxvii. 35), seem at first sight to settle the question entirely against Jacob. Cornelius a Lapide, following Origen, Cassian and St. John Chrysostom, speaks in no dubious terms of an objective lie, but inclines with them to defend the

[1] For a full treatment of the difficulties *cf.* Hetzenauer *Genesis*, pp. 402-3.

patriarch's good faith on account of God's prediction (Gen. xxv. 23), that 'the elder shall serve the younger,' and because Esau sold his right to the blessing when he made away his birthright. Prediction of itself, it is true, is not sanction, but surely Jacob actually obtained God's blessing through Isaac when he acquired possession of the birthright, though the means taken was objectively wrong. Hence, the prediction is probably a definite promise. The above explanation, then, might be developed something like this. To Rebecca, and eventually to Jacob, the stratagem involved nothing wrong, but a fulfilment in the only way they saw possible of God's prediction. God would not, on this explanation, have allowed the objective wrong to stand in the way of the blessing He had ordained should be Jacob's. That Isaac afterwards called the conduct deceitful was due to his ignorance of the contract sealed by the oath of Esau. To ensure the blessing by means which to mother and son may have appeared blameless—since 'I am Esau,' might mean 'I have Esau's rights,' and 'I am he whom God predicted should supplant Esau'—would be free from guilt.

Against this view it must be noted as strange that after obtaining the blessing it would be expected that Jacob should justify himself, whereas throughout Jacob is filled with fear and trembling; while Isaac's views on the morality of the act seem to be given as the last word. Further, it supposes rather an advanced idea of mental restriction. Again, can it be conceived that God would allow objective wrong, in the case of a patriarch, to pass unreproved? He did not so deal with Pharaoh, as will be pointed out later. Isaac's rebuke seems clearly enough to be delivered to one who was conscious of wrong.

Hence it seems truer to admit even formal wrong on Jacob's part. If this view be adopted, it must be noted that God cannot have sanctioned his conduct at all. The blessing received by the future patriarch would have been ordained for him, but in some other way; and, being obtained by fraud, would not be an unmixed blessing. A. Lapide at most admits a venial sin, because Jacob's lie to obtain the final ratification by Isaac was directed merely to securing his own rights made over by Esau. Fr. Hetzenauer, following this view, points out that Rebecca was punished by being compelled to send away her son to Mesopotamia and live separated from him for twenty years; while Jacob testified to his own

afflictions in Mesopotamia and Chanaan: 'The days of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years, few and evil' (Gen. xlvii. 9).

Jacob's stratagem against Laban (Gen. xxix.-xxxi.) is, however, definitely approved of by God (Gen. xxxi. 9, 12), and it must be remembered that the patriarch had himself been grievously deceived by Laban as regards his term of service for Rachel and also the wages of his labour. The justification of his act may, therefore, be said to consist in legitimate recuperation of his due.

As to Abraham's readiness to sacrifice his son, it is praiseworthy, for he recognised God's right over his son's life. He spoke the truth, too, in calling his wife his sister in order to protect his own life. She was his step-sister. What is said of Pharaoh on this occasion constitutes a difficulty (Gen. xii. 17): 'But the Lord scourged Pharaoh and his house with most grievous stripes for Sarai, Abram's wife.' It must be borne in mind, nevertheless, that God often sends affliction not merely as punishment, but to teach men lessons they would not otherwise learn. So here, it may be that God wished to impress on Pharaoh that his action was objectively wrong, or that Abraham enjoyed a very special divine protection, and that he and his must be treated with profound respect. The scourge may have been the only way such a one as Pharaoh could be taught.

Lastly, a few words must be said on the Israelitic cult, as found in the Pentateuch. The striking feature about it is that there is no gradual development from the simple sacrifices of the patriarchs at the scenes of Yahweh's apparitions, by some well, or under a memorable tree, into the fuller worship of Mosaic times. Outside the Church, the documentary hypothesis is held to explain the passages which deal with an advanced state of worship as coming from a later hand. But with the exodus began a very distinct epoch, and this was inaugurated by a sudden burst of glory in the numerous and detailed divine ordinances: the sanctification of the people, especially of the first-born, duties of priests and levites, confession, the law of the Nazarites, special feasts, and, above all, the gorgeous ritual of the Tabernacle of the Testimony. Precious woods and stones, gold and silver of the purest, vestments and draperies of the richest dye and embroidery, and all the cunning of the goldsmith, jeweller and perfumer now

are pressed into the service of Yahweh, who is to lead them to the conquest of the Promised Land. Sacrifice is still for a time permitted ' in every place where the memory of (God's) name shall be ' (Exod. xx. 24), but the ark is the pledge of future unity of worship in Jerusalem, and the cult centres specially around this sacred receptacle of the ' testimony ' and peculiar abode of Yahweh. The centralisation of worship, however, is not yet complete. Lev. xvii. 3-4, is only a temporary injunction necessitated by the danger of idolatry in the wilderness; while Deut. xii. 13, 14, refers to the future, as is recognised in 3 Kings iii. 2, for as yet ' there was no Temple built to the name of the Lord.'

Bible
Comment.(O.T.)
L.
184468
Old Testament
Author Lattey, Cuthbert (ed.)
Title Moses and the law.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU